

Hamline University DigitalCommons@Hamline

Departmental Honors Projects


College of Liberal Arts

Spring 2017

Monolingualism in a Multicultural Nation: The Impact of Nationalism and Color-blind Racial Ideologies on Support for English-Only Policies

Anna Benker
Hamline University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/dhp>

 Part of the [Anthropological Linguistics and Sociolinguistics Commons](#), and the [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Benker, Anna, "Monolingualism in a Multicultural Nation: The Impact of Nationalism and Color-blind Racial Ideologies on Support for English-Only Policies" (2017). *Departmental Honors Projects*. 62.
<https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/dhp/62>

This Honors Project is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Liberal Arts at DigitalCommons@Hamline. It has been accepted for inclusion in Departmental Honors Projects by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Hamline. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@hamline.edu, lterveer01@hamline.edu.

Monolingualism in a Multicultural Nation: The Impact of Nationalism and Color-blind Racial Ideologies on Support for English-Only Policies

Anna Benker

An Honors Thesis

**Submitted for partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation with honors in
Sociology from Hamline University**

04/03/2017

Abstract:

The United States is one of few nations yet to name an official language. However, the desire to make English the official language of the US has been prevalent throughout history and remains strong to this day. The purpose of this study is to examine the factors that are related to greater support for English-Only policy. Previous studies have found that ideas of nationalism, specifically holding ethno-cultural criteria of national membership, is correlated with greater support for English-Only policy (Citrin et al, 1990; Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997; Garcia and Bass, 2007; Schildkraut, 2003). This study will retest some of these previous studies, while also enhancing them through the use of various nationally representative datasets and the incorporation of more measures of criteria of national membership. Additionally, this study seeks to fill a gap in the existing literature on the connections between English-Only support and color-blind racial ideologies. Frendreis and Tatalovich (1997) found that explicit intergroup racial hostility was not the basis for English-Only support. However, no studies have been done on how more covert forms of racism, arguably the more common form in today's society, are connected with English-Only support. The primary relationships described above will be analyzed while controlling for multiple sociodemographic variables. Based on the existing research, it is expected that as general feelings of nationalism increase, so will support for English-Only policy. Furthermore, those who hold an ethnocultural view of nationalism will be more likely to support English-Only policy than those who don't. Finally, endorsement of color-blind racial ideologies will be correlated with increased support for English-Only policy. These hypotheses will be tested using regression analysis on two secondary datasets as well as originally collected data. Findings suggest that endorsement of ethno-cultural criteria of national membership and of color-blind racial ideologies is related to increased support for English-Only policy.

Introduction

On December 22nd, 2016, a woman at a J.C. Penney in Louisville, Kentucky was filmed making incredibly racist and hateful remarks towards two Hispanic women who had presumably cut in front of her at the checkout line. Included in her rant were phrases such as, “Tell them to go back where they belong” and “The taxpayers probably paid for all that stuff”. However, one of the last things that the woman is filmed saying before the video cuts off is “Speak English, you’re in America. If you don’t know it, learn it”. This belief, that everyone in the United States must speak English, has pervaded personal and political discourse throughout much of the nation’s history. The desire to assert linguistic dominance is not a new phenomenon in our society (Citrin et al, 1990).

Nevertheless, scholars have found that reactions to hostility towards minority groups have become more lenient within the past year and a half, specifically in correlation to the candidacy and election of President Donald Trump (Schaffner et al, 2017). The nativist rhetoric used by Donald Trump throughout his candidacy has not only promoted greater tolerance of such discourse within the political realm and among voters, but this rhetoric may in fact also be the grounds for his victory over Hillary Clinton (Nteta & Schaffner, 2016; Schaffner et al, 2017). Studies have shown that, both during and after the election, negative attitudes towards racial minorities among whites has correlated with support for Trump (Denison, 2016; Nteta & Schaffner, 2016; Schaffner et al, 2017; Tesler, 2015). With the prospect of an America governed by Trump for the next four years, it is quite possible that more and more people, emboldened by his xenophobic rhetoric, will begin to voice opinions similar to the woman at J.C. Penney. Therefore, with the current political climate of our nation, it is essential that we have an understanding of what factors prompt people to support or oppose policies that impact minority groups, such as English-Only language policies. This project seeks to explore how two concepts

in particular, nationalism and color-blind racial ideologies, impact support for English-Only policies.

My decision to study both nationalism and color-blind racism in relation to English-Only policies may seem peculiar to some readers, as the connection between these three concepts might not be readily apparent. My background in sociolinguistics is what led to my desire to study English-Only language policies. Specifically, I sought to gain a better understanding of why people favor monolingualism in our nation. Initial research revealed that many people perceive multilingualism as a threat to unity in the United States (Citrin et al, 1990; Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997; Nieto, 2015; Pac, 2012; Wiley and Lukes, 1996). This desire for unity (and also the maintenance of power by majority groups) at the expense of ethnocultural diversity has additionally been cited as one of the underlying motivators behind color-blind racial ideologies (Aleinikoff, 1991; Dovidio et al, 2009; Hehman et al, 2012, Neville et al, 2000). The notion that acknowledging race is equivalent to racism and therefore will only perpetuate discrimination has pervaded much of white America (Aleinikoff, 1991; Flagg, 1993, Schofield, 1986; Tatum, 1999; Tarca, 2005). Commentary on color-blindness outside of the academic realm reveals an unspoken pressure to never address race and simply view everyone as “human beings”. Therefore, an attempt to promote a homogeneous society can be seen with both language use and perceptions of race.

This study strives to characterize the paradoxical context of our nation, wherein there is a push to promote sameness by requiring some ethno-cultural traits (such as English language use) while simultaneously ignoring others (such as race). Based on an examination of the existing literature, the two questions motivating this study are 1). How do ideas of criteria for national membership relate to support for English-Only policy and 2). Are those who hold color-blind racial ideologies more likely to support English-Only policies?

The concept of nationalism is something that most people in the United States are familiar with. Yet among scholars, there is no single, agreed upon definition. Nationalism can

broadly be defined as the “complex of ideas, sentiments, and representations by which Americans understand the United States and their relationship to it” (Bonikowski and DiMaggio, 2016). Beyond this, scholars have also broken down nationalism into various components (Bonikowski and DiMaggio, 2016; Citrin et. al., 1994; Stilz, 2009). Bonikowski and DiMaggio separate nationalism into four distinct aspects: national identification, criteria of national membership, pride in the nation’s heritage and institutions, and national hubris. Of specific interest to this paper is Bonikowski and DiMaggio’s concept of criteria of national membership. Criteria of national membership is the aspect of nationalism that emphasizes the belief that certain qualifications are required in order for someone to be considered a true American. These qualifications can either be ethnocultural (such as country of birth, religion, language use) or civic (a shared sense of values and ideals) (Bonikowski and DiMaggio, 2016).

Scholars have examined the relationship between nationalism and English-Only policies in the past. In their 1997 study, Frendreis and Tatalovich found that attitudinal variables and conceptions of national identity (in contrast with demographic variables) were the greatest predictors for English-Only policy support or opposition. As one might expect, they found that those who held the belief that “speaking English is part of being a good American” were more likely to support English-Only policies (Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997). Also of importance, scholars have found that high levels of nationalism are correlated with hostility towards immigrants and other foreign-born groups (Bonikowski and DiMaggio, 2016; Citrin, Reingold and Green, 1990). That is, this hostility is targeted towards the groups who are most likely to use a preferred language besides English.

While scholars have examined the relationship between nationalism and English-Only language policies in the past, less information is available on the connections between race relations and English-Only support or opposition. Nevertheless, the study of racial attitudes in connection with English-Only policies is not a completely novel idea. Of particular relevance to this study is Frendreis and Tatalovich’s (1997) finding that those who expressed intergroup

hostility (based on race) were not more or less likely to support English-Only policies. However, in this study racial hostility was framed in very explicit terms, with respondents being asked to use feeling thermometers to indicate how they feel towards certain minority groups on a scale of “very warm or favorable” to “very cold or unfavorable”. In today’s society, less and less people are likely to endorse this kind of explicit racial hostility. Rather, more covert and subconscious forms of racism are pervading in the nation. The connection between this covert racism, or color-blind racism, and English-Only language policies has yet to be addressed by scholars. The purpose of the this study is to fill this gap in the existing literature.

Color-blind racism is defined as “the explanation of contemporary racial inequality as the outcome of non-racial dynamics” (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). This is in contrast to the explicit acceptance and promotion of racist practices during and prior to the Jim Crow era. Sociologist Eduardo Bonilla-Silva has arguably been the most prominent scholar in the definition and study of color-blind racism. One of his most notable pieces of work is his 2006 book *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. In his book, Bonilla-Silva discusses the emergence of color-blind racism in the United States, the ways in which color-blind racism is perpetuated and what demographic of people is most likely to embrace color-blind ideologies. However, one of the most significant products of this book is his classification of color-blind racism into four central frames: abstract liberalism, naturalization, cultural racism and minimization of racism. Bonilla-Silva argues that these frames are the “road maps” for interpreting the surrounding world through a color-blind lens (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Bonilla-Silva’s four frames served as a guiding tool in the creation of my own data collection instrument.

Based on a review of the existing literature regarding nationalism and color-blind racial ideologies, I propose three main hypotheses for this study. First, I hypothesize that as general feelings of nationalism increase, support for English-Only policies will also increase. This is based on previous findings that high levels of nationalism correlate with hostility towards

immigrants and foreign-born groups (Bonikowski and DiMaggio, 2016; Citrin, Reingold and Green, 1990), as well as Citrin et al's (1990) finding that feelings of nationalism and national identity were the main determiners between support or opposition to English-Only policies. Second, similar to Schildkraut's (2003) findings, I hypothesize that those who endorse an ethno-cultural criteria of national membership will be more likely to support English-Only language policies. One would expect that those who place a high value on cultural and ethnic traits would be more likely favor English-Only policies, whether or not they also value shared civic traits. Finally, I hypothesize that those who endorse color-blind racial ideologies will be more likely to support English-Only policies.

The methodology of this project is broken up into two components: an analysis of two, nationally representative datasets along with an analysis of originally collected data using a self-created survey instrument. The first secondary dataset examined was the General Social Survey (GSS) data collected in 1994. GSS, a nationally representative data source, covers a range of attitudinal and demographic variables. Due to the limited availability of relevant variables in a more recent year, 1994 was chosen for the analysis. However, it was thought that data from 1994 could prove useful by providing a scope of attitudinal change (compared to my own survey collection) throughout the approximately 20 years since the data was collected. The other secondary dataset examined was the 21st Century Americanism: Nationally Representative Survey of the United States Population, a dataset from 2004 that focuses specifically on ideas about "Americanism" and attitudes towards foreign-born and minority groups.

Variables from 1994 GSS and 21st Century Americanism were compiled into two separate datasets using the Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS). For each dataset, the dependent variable, or the outcome variable, was a measure of support or opposition towards English-Only language policies. While the variables within each of these datasets are not identical, they were combined in such a way that they still capture the same

complex concepts. Multiple independent variables were included to measure the complex concepts of nationalism and color-blind racial ideologies. The decision of which variables to include as measures of criteria of national membership and color-blind racial ideologies were drawn from an extensive exploration of previous studies on these topics. Also included in each dataset were a number of demographic controls found in the existing literature to play a role in conceptions about nationalism and color-blindness.

For the second component of this study, original data was collected via a self-created survey tool. This survey proved advantageous because it allowed for the drawing of questions from GSS and 21st Century Americanism, while also supplementing questions that were pertinent but not offered by either dataset. Like the two secondary datasets, the dependent variable in this survey measures support or opposition for English-Only policies, and the independent variables are a combination of measures for general levels of nationalism, criteria of national membership, color-blind racial ideologies and demographics. The survey was administered in two ways. First, it was distributed online via snowball sampling through a variety of my own social networks. Next, the survey was distributed among students within twelve courses at a small liberal arts college in the midwest.

While the originally collected data is not equivalent to two, nationally representative datasets, I argue that comparing the three datasets provides an understanding as to how attitudes have changed across the past two decades (from 1994 to 2004 to 2017). This comparison between years provides a unique contribution methodologically to the existing research. While determining the cause of any variance across the datasets is beyond the scope of this study, being aware of this variance could guide future research. Furthermore, the inclusion of these three different datasets provides a diversity of sources that very few other studies include, thereby strengthening the credibility of the results.

This study enhances the existing research for several other key reasons. Firstly, this study thoroughly analyzes several complex constructs by using multiple variables to measure

the concepts. This assures that many, if not all, of the elements of each concept addressed in the existing literature are accounted for. For example, all four of Bonilla-Silva's frames of color-blindness are included in this analysis, allowing for a more thorough understanding of how color-blind racism is correlated with attitudes towards English-Only language policies. Secondly, this study is valuable because it indirectly retests multiple findings from previously existing literature on the connections between levels of nationalism and support for English-Only language policies. Comparisons between my findings and past findings can be made to gain a better overall understanding of nationalism and English-Only policies are related. Finally, as mentioned above, this is one of the first studies to ever analyze the relationship between English-Only language policies and color-blind racism.

Literature Review

The following literature review is divided into three categories: English-Only policy, nationalism and color-blind racial ideologies. Each of these categories is then further broken down into different subsections based on the relevant themes in the literature. Within the English-Only policy section, a brief history of language policies in the United States. will be discussed, followed by an analysis of three of the main arguments for English-Only policies and an examination of the demographics of English-Only support. Next, nationalism will be introduced with a broad definition, followed by a more thorough analysis of the various components of nationalism and which demographic of people is most likely to endorse each of these components. Finally, a definition and brief history of color-blind racial ideologies will be discussed, followed by an examination of Bonilla-Silva's (2011) four frames of color-blindness and a demographic analysis of who is most likely to be colorblind.

English-Only Policy

English-Only vs. English Official

As English language laws are predominantly referred to as English-Only policy throughout this study, it is important to characterize the distinction between English-Only and English-Official laws. Whereas English-Only laws are more ambiguous in that they suggest a complete outlawing of the use of any language besides English, English-Official laws are often more specific to the sole use of English in all government business. Proponents of English-Official laws often justify their position by maintaining that they are not trying to completely eradicate the study and use of other languages. However, they argue that the role of other languages should be reserved for the private sphere (U.S. English, n.d).

English-Official policy support is what will be measured quantitatively in this study; specifically, support or opposition for the use of solely English in government business. However, due to the discriminatory ideologies (discussed further on in this literature review) that often underlie English-Official policies, I argue that it is still appropriate to refer to them as English-Only policy. While political figures may not be trying to completely wipe out other language besides English, they are still working to make English the only language of the public sphere. This is an infringement on the linguistic rights of individuals, as well as their first and fifth amendment right to equal protection, by trying to relegate the role of their native language to the private sphere (ACLU, 2012).

History of English-Only Policy

The push for an English-Only language policy dates back to the beginning of the 20th century. During this time, a rise in immigration, and therefore of new languages, was unsettling to the English-speaking majority. This unease reached a peak following WWI as xenophobia spread through the country. Roughly twenty years later, shortly following WWII, fifteen states had passed English-Only policies. After this surge in political response, English-Only policies wouldn't come back into the national spotlight until the 1960s. The growth of the Civil Rights Movement, lifts on immigration quotas from non-European nations and the implementation of

the Bilingual Education Act reignited a desire for English-Only policies from the English-speaking majority (Citrin et al, 1990).

Despite a history of opposition to foreign languages, the first attempt to actually amend the Constitution in favor of English-Only did not occur until 1981. The proposal, named the English Language Amendment (ELA), was put forward by Senator S.I. Hayakawa. Hayakawa argued that not having a national language would result in disunion and disorder. After initial failure, the ELA was proposed again in 1983 and 1985, but still to no avail. This prompted English-Only advocates to shift their focus away from federal policy to the states (Citrin et al, 1990).

Of the variety of state level English-Only legislation, perhaps one of the most well known is California's Proposition 63. Built on the idea of "preserving and strengthening" the English language, the proposition declared English the official language of California and prevented the passage of any laws that threatened the use of English. Despite the fact that many well-known public figures such as politicians, Catholic bishops, and social justice interest groups were not in support of Proposition 63, the citizens of California passed the amendment with a 73% approval rate. The enactment of Proposition 63 would later inspire similar laws in states such as Arizona, Colorado and Florida (Citrin et al, 1990).

While there has yet to be a national policy declaring English as the official language, thirty-two states have individually implemented English-Official legislation (Pac, 2012). This does not mean that desire for national-level English-Only policies has disappeared. Rather, support for such measures has remained strong throughout the past several decades. According to the two nationally representative datasets used in this study (GSS and 21st Century Americanism), support for an official English law has risen from 62.8% in 1994 to 70.8% in 2004, and support has only continued to increase in the past several years. In a 2014 poll conducted by Rasmussen Reports, now up to 83% of American adults reported that English should be the official language of the United States.

This public support for English-Only policy has been continued to be reflected in the political realm as well. Most recently, a renewed addition of the English Language Unity Act of 2005 was introduced in the house on February 9th, 2017. Since its introduction in 2005, a new version of the bill has been brought to congress almost every following year. Similar to past proposals, this bill would make English the official language of the United States and would require that naturalization ceremonies and government function are conducted in English (Congress.gov, n.d.). Furthermore, the campaign and election of President Donald Trump has also signalled a potential renewal of English-Only rhetoric to come in the next four years. While Trump has yet to formally state that English should be the official language of the U.S., his actions throughout the campaign trail and within his first months in office have suggested that he is in favor of English-Only policy. For example, Trump is the only republican presidential nominee in the past three elections to have no Spanish translations of his campaign materials. Additionally, he openly criticized his republican opponent, Jeb Bush, for speaking Spanish throughout the campaign, stating, “This is a country where we speak English, not Spanish” (Goldmacher, 2016). While previous presidents have had similar ideas to Donald Trump about the use of other languages within the nation, his intense and fervent nativist rhetoric is something that the nation arguably hasn’t seen since the anti-immigrant ideologies following WWI.

Existing studies on English-Only policies have offered several reasons as to why people support English as the official national language. These include the use of the English language as a symbol of American identity, the perceived threat of other languages to national unity and the use of monolingualism as a method of control over minority groups (Borden, 2014; Citrin et al, 1990; Garcia & Bass, 2007; Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997; Nieto, 2015; Pac, 2012; Wiley and Lukes, 1996).

English as an Emblem

Research has found that the English language serves as an important symbol of American identity for many people (Borden, 2014; Citrin et al, 1990; Garcia & Bass, 2007; Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997; Pac, 2012). Garcia and Bass use the Symbolic Politics Model to analyze the use of the English language as a cultural symbol in the United States. The Symbolic Politics Model holds that cultural symbols, such as language, are used as a marker for what it means to be an American. People's perceptions of these symbols can then influence how they view certain issues and policies surrounding these symbols, including language policy (Garcia and Bass, 2007). Political psychologist Schildkraut discovered similar findings in her 2003 study on national identity and attitudes towards English-Only policy. Schildkraut conducted fourteen focus groups (three Hispanic, eight non-Hispanic white and three ethnically heterogeneous) with a mean of eight participants per group. She found that those who hold ethno-cultural sentiments of nationalism were likely to agree that the English language is, "an integral part of American identity" (2003). While Schildkraut's study is valuable for providing a thorough, ideological discussion of a complex topic, it also lacks generalizability to the nation at large. Schildkraut even acknowledges this drawback herself. Therefore, analyses using a nationally representative data source are instrumental in furthering an understanding of how nationalism and English-Only policy are correlated.

Because the English language is seen as an extension of America itself, the use of other languages besides English can be interpreted as a rejection of U.S. ideals (Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997; Garcia and Bass, 2007; Nieto, 2015; Pac, 2012). Frendreis and Tatalovich (1997) offer an examination of this idea by using Citrin et. al's (1994) three ideologies of diversity. One of these three ideologies, Cosmopolitan Liberalism, supports an English-Only policy by arguing that the use of English is needed for immigrants to establish a true commitment to the U.S. and its values. In their study, Frendreis and Tatalovich ran a regression analysis on data from the 1992 National Election Study in order to determine what attributes predict support for English-Only policy. They found that the strongest predictors were not

sociodemographic, but rather ideological. Specifically, Frendreis and Tatalovich found that those whose ideology aligned with Cosmopolitan Liberalism were more likely to support English-Only policy. That is, those who were most likely to support English-Only agreed with the belief that “speaking English is related to being a good American ” (Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997).

The Threat to Unity

Another chief argument by English-Only proponents is that a common language will unify the nation (Citrin et al, 1990; Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997; Nieto, 2015; Pac, 2012; Wiley and Lukes, 1996). In their study, Wiley and Lukes cite four ideological arguments for monolingualism followed by Kloss’ (1971) critique of each argument. The fourth ideological argument for monolingualism, termed the “National Unity Argument”, asserts that when immigrants bring their new languages into the United States, it threatens the solidarity of the nation. Therefore, all new immigrants should be required to relinquish the use of their native language rights as a form of payment for admission to the U.S. Kloss’ critique of this rationale asserts that any lack of loyalty towards the U.S. by immigrants usually stems from experiences of discrimination and hostility. While Wiley and Lukes’ study is not empirically based, it nevertheless provides important theoretical insight into the idea of English as a unifying entity (Wiley and Lukes, 1996).

Nieto (2015) found similar conclusions about the perception of English as a unifying force. In his study on the intentions and outcomes of English-Only policy, Nieto utilized a critical discourse analysis of language, an approach that examines the social and cultural roles of language along with its linguistic function. His study is split into two methodologies, a qualitative literary analysis of existing English-Only policy and a state-level quantitative analysis examining what factors are associated with English-Only policy implementation within the state. Nieto cites a text from “U.S. English”, an official group in the United States dedicated to establishing English Only-Policy. According to the text, English-Only is needed for a common means of communication between a diverse array of peoples. Furthermore, they argue that an English-

Only policy will pressure new immigrants to learn the language so that they can partake in governmental and political proceedings (US English, n.d.). Nieto's study provides a thorough and unique perspective on the issue of language policy through his analysis of English policy texts themselves. However, his quantitative analysis of English-Only policy only looks at the state level. While a state-level perspective is important for understanding English-Only ideology, it does not provide a complete picture of how support for English-Only policy operates as a national phenomenon.

Language as a Method of Control

While a loyal and unified nation seems like a noble objective, research has shown that English-Only policy often has an undercurrent of hostility towards minority groups, specifically immigrants (Borden, 2014; Frendreis and Tatalovic, 1997; Garcia and Bass, 2007; Nieto, 2015; Pac, 2012; Wiley and Lukes, 1996). As non-native English speaking immigrants, particularly from Hispanic/Latino nations, are generally the main targets of English-Only policy, it is important to further examine the connection between English-Only support and attitudes towards this group of people.

Across studies, attitudes towards documented and undocumented immigrants have been found to be a predictor for support of English-Only policy (Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997; Garcia and Bass, 2007). As mentioned above, the perceived threat to the dominant culture and way of life in the United States by an increasing number of immigrants has been a motivating factor for English-Only policy. Specifically, Garcia and Bass (2007) note the threat felt by many lower-class Americans that immigrants will lessen their access to low-level jobs. Furthermore, hostility towards illegal immigrants in particular, whose status and rights within the United States are viewed with less legitimacy compared to legal immigrants, has been found to be related to support or opposition for English-Only policy (Garcia and Bass, 2007). In sum, scholars have found that openness towards immigrants can be a telling predictor for English-Only support (Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997; Garcia and Bass, 2007).

For example, in Frenndries and Tatalovich's study mentioned above, they found that hostility towards illegal immigrants was directly correlated with support for English-Only Policy. However, there was no correlation between hostility towards other types of racial minority groups (in this case Hispanics and Asians) and support for English-Only policy. This suggests that support for English-Only policy may not be due to hostility towards other races in general, but rather towards groups that are new to the nation (Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997).

Pac (2012) discusses the hegemonic nature of English-Only policy in her literary analysis of language policies in 21st century America. According to Pac, the erasure of minority languages has been "rooted in xenophobia" since the time of the first Anglo-Saxon elites. Pac cites a 1997 article by Lippi-Green, who asserts that because it is no longer socially acceptable to discriminate based on race, ethnicity or country of origin, language is being used as a way to continue to disadvantage certain groups of people. According to Wiley and Lukes' (1996) study, this covert form of prejudice results in dominant language groups using restrictive language policies as a form of social, political and economic control. For example, English-Only policy has been used to prevent people from immigrating, voting and applying for jobs. Furthermore, Pac contends that the dominant language group does not perceive language minorities' lack of success as a result of oppressive language practices. Rather, their circumstances are viewed through the deficit model. That is, their failures are seen as a result of their own cultural values and characteristics rather than systematic linguistic oppression (2012).

Who Supports English-Only Policy: Demographics

The question of who supports English-Only policy has been prevalent throughout the literature. What individual characteristics, if any, do these people share? As stated above, attitudes towards illegal immigrants have been cited as a predictor for English-Only language policy (Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997). Garcia and Bass (2007) analyzed data from the 2001

Survey of American Attitudes to further examine this question. From their analyses, they concluded that age and race were significant predictors of English-Only attitudes, with younger and non-white Americans being less likely to support English-Only policy. It is important to note that the questions examined by Garcia and Bass specifically looked at English-Only policies within the school system. Therefore, while overlap for English-Only support in schools and throughout the country at large is possible, this type of extrapolation cannot be certain.

Freundreis and Tatalovich (1997) also found that those who identify as conservative, non-Hispanic whites and those who live in towns of under 50,000 people were most likely to support English-Only policies. However, they also contend that the best predictors for English-Only support aren't demographic variables, but rather attitudinal variables. Specifically, they found that agreement with the idea that "good Americans speak English" and support for the melting pot metaphor were the strongest indicators of English-Only support. Because the focus of their study wasn't explicitly on ethno-cultural criteria of national membership, Freundreis and Tatalovich only used three measures to capture this concept. Therefore, this study will help further understanding of how criteria of national membership impacts English-Only support by including more ethno-cultural measures as well as also incorporating measures of civic criteria to act as controls.

Citrin et al (1990) likewise found that race and ethnicity play a role in English-Only support. In their multivariate analysis, they discovered that Blacks and Whites were more likely to support English-Only policy than Hispanics and Asians. However, similar to Freundreis and Tatalovich's (1997) study, Citrin et al also found that feelings of nationalism and national identity were the main determiners of support or opposition to English-Only policies (Citrin et al, 1990). Finally, Citrin et al concluded that economic outlook had no impact on support for English-Only policy.

Nationalism

What is Nationalism?

Based on the literature examined above, it is not difficult to see how language policy and ideas about nationalism are intertwined. Therefore, in order to understand the English-Only movement fully, one must also understand how nationalism functions in the United States. Across studies, scholars have yet to agree on a single definition of nationalism, however, there are many overarching themes. Broadly speaking, nationalism is the, “complex of ideas, sentiments, and representations by which Americans understand the United States and their relationship to it” (Bonikowski and DiMaggio, 2016). Nationalism is not a single, static entity. Rather, nationalism is something that is continually reevaluated and reproduced through a person’s everyday interactions (Bonikowski, 2008; Bonikowski and DiMaggio, 2016). Scholars also seem to agree that nationalism in the United States can be broken down into two major categories: civic nationalism and ethno-cultural nationalism. Civic nationalism is defined by a shared sense of values and ideals (such as hard work, political participation, etc.) whereas ethno-cultural nationalism is based upon cultural characteristics such as religion, birthplace and race. That is, who is considered an American is determined by whether they possess these characteristics (Bonikowski and DiMaggio, 2016; Stiltz, 2009). Citrin et. al (1994), as cited by Bonikowski and DiMaggio, provides a third category of nationalism: incorporationism. Those who hold an incorporationist view of nationalism believe that as a nation founded on immigrants, we continually benefit from the new waves of immigrants that come and assimilate into U.S. culture (Bonikowski and DiMaggio, 2016).

Four Aspects of Nationalism

Bonikowski and DiMaggio (2016) offer a more thorough definition of nationalism by breaking this concept into four different aspects: national identification, criteria of national membership, pride in the nation’s heritage and institutions, and national hubris. National identification emphasizes how close a person feels to their country. It looks at the importance of a person’s identity as a member of that nation compared to other parts of their identity such as kinship, race, etc. Criteria of national membership, similar to civic and ethno-cultural

nationalism, looks at what characteristics are thought to be required to be a “true American”. Pride in the nation’s heritage and institutions, as the name suggests, examines how proud a person is of their country’s past along with its achievements in various realms of life such as the economy, military, art and literature, etc. Finally, national hubris analyzes whether a person views their country as superior in relation to others.

Four Types of Nationalists

Using the four aspects of nationalism, Bonikowski and DiMaggio (2016) identify that there are also four different kinds of nationalists. Using data from the 2004 GSS social survey, Bonikowski and DiMaggio conducted a latent class analysis and determined that there are four classes of nationalists: ardent, disengaged, restrictive and creedal. Of these four groups, ardent and disengaged nationalists were classified as opposite ends of a spectrum, while restrictive and creedal nationalists fall between these two extremes. According to Bonikowski and DiMaggio’s analysis, ardent nationalists are the most likely to feel close to America, to hold an ethno-cultural view of nationalism, to report being proud of America and to hold a strong national hubris. The disengaged are the least likely to feel close to the nation, to hold any nationalist sentiments and to take pride in the nation. Restrictive nationalists lack national pride but hold ethno-cultural views of what it means to be an American. Finally, creedal nationalists demonstrate great pride in the nation, but they do not believe that being a “true American” requires certain ethno-cultural characteristics (Bonikowski and DiMaggio, 2016).

Three Approaches to Nationalism

Bonikowski (2008) offers an additional view of nationalism by separating it into three approaches: political, psychological and cultural. Political nationalism observes nationalism at the level of the masses, with specific interest in their political elites. It examines how politicians use nationalist sentiment to further their goals. Psychological nationalism examines nationalism on an individual level and analyzes how individuals associate with the “generalized image of the

nation”. Lastly, cultural nationalism examines how nationalist sentiments are reproduced through everyday interactions and shared symbols (Bonikowski, 2008).

Demographics of Nationalism

As with English-Only policy support, researchers have found that the different types of nationalism are correlated along certain demographic variables. Citin et al (1990) found that perceptions of nationalism vary by ethnicity, political orientation, age, education and income. Additionally, Bonikowski and DiMaggio (2016) found that one of the biggest indicators for the type of nationalist a person qualifies as is religion. Identifying as a Christian was shown to be the biggest differentiator between creedal and disengaged nationalists from restrictive and ardent nationalists. In particular, identifying as an Evangelical Protestant was strongly correlated with being an ardent nationalist (2016).

As stated previously, nationalism is not static but rather changes over time. Therefore, along with demographic variables, national mood can be used as a predictor for overall levels and types of nationalism in the country (Bonikowski, 2008; Bonikowski and DiMaggio, 2016). Public mood, defined by Rahn (2004) as the “shared affective feeling of the nation”, has been shown to change during times of national crisis (such as 9/11). Collins (2012) argues that these times of crises impact public mood by “intensifying national attachment and increasing unconditional support for state institutions, producing ‘time-bubbles of nationalism’”. Studies have also indicated that during these times of crisis, ideas of ardent and ethno-cultural nationalism grow stronger as nativist and xenophobic sentiments become more prevalent. (Bonikowski and DiMaggio, 2016).

Attitudes towards immigrants and other foreign-born groups can also be predicted by examining levels of nationalism. In their 1990 analysis of a public opinion poll in California, Citrin, Reingold and Green found that ideas of ethno-cultural nationalism are strongly correlated with hostility towards cultural minorities. Bonikowski and DiMaggio (2016) found similar results in their study. They determined that holding an ethno-cultural criterion of national membership

and a strong national hubris corresponded to a negative view of immigrants and a desire to be isolated/protected from the rest of the world.

Color-blind Racism

Not only is it critical to examine the sources of hostility towards foreign-born peoples, it is also crucial that sources of antipathy towards native-born minority groups are examined. If attitudes towards immigrants can be used as a predictor for English-Only policy, can attitudes towards native-born minority groups also be used to as a way to predict support for English-Only policy? In their regression analysis of data from the 1992 National Election Study, Frensdreis and Tatalovich (1997) found that intergroup hostility (based on race) was not the basis for support for English-Only policy. However, this conclusion was based upon the use of feeling thermometers, a survey tool that has participants rate their feelings towards a group of people on a scale from “very warm or favorable” to “very cold or unfavorable”. Therefore, it frames the issue of racial hostility in very explicit terms. Color-blind racism on the other hand, examines how racial hostilities and inequalities are perpetuated in more covert, subconscious ways.

History of Color-blind Racism

According to Zamudio and Rios (2006), racism can be broken down into two main subsets, traditional racism and liberal racism. Traditional racism refers to acts that are explicitly racist and stem from bigotry. Liberal racism, or color-blind racism, is a more subtle form of racism founded on the ideals of meritocracy and equality. Bonilla-Silva (2006) argues that color-blind racism is a response to shifting race relations in the past few decades. Because the majority of society now condemns blatant, explicit forms of racism, dominant groups have found a new strategy for maintaining racial inequality. Color-blind racism thrives on the idea that because these explicit forms of racism have disappeared, so has racism. In reality, a more covert form of racism has taken prevalence (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). While being “color-blind” is often considered virtuous and politically correct, it ultimately masks and invalidates the racial

inequality that is still present today (Aleinikoff, 1991; Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Bonilla-Silva and Dietrich, 2011; Lewis, 2001; Neville et al, 2000; Tarca, 2005)

Components of Color-blind Racism

Color-blind racism is centered around two main components, color evasion and power evasion. As defined by sociologist Ruth Frankenberg, color evasion is the practice of negating racial differences as a way to emphasize sameness and invalidate diverse experiences. Power evasion can be broken down into two parts: 1. the rejection of white privilege and of the idea that institutional and systematic forms of racism exist in our nation and 2. the belief that social policies shouldn't be implemented as a way to promote equity. Power evasion allows dominant racial groups to claim that all members of society are on an equal playing field and that any lack of success can't be blamed on racism (Neville et al, 2000).

Bonilla-Silva and Dietrich (2011) further break down these two components into Bonilla-Silva's Four Frames of Color-blind Racism: abstract liberalism, naturalization, cultural racism, and minimization of racism. Abstract liberalism, like power evasion, is based on the belief that everyone has an equal opportunity for success. It advocates for the ideologies of individualism and meritocracy, claiming that the government should not intervene by giving some groups "preferential treatment" as compensation for something that happened in the past. However, valuing equality while ignoring equity allows dominant groups to maintain their position of power while still appearing moral.

Naturalization is the justification of racial inequalities by claiming that they occur naturally. For example, residential segregation and homogeneous friend groups are explained with the logic that people naturally group together with others like themselves. This framework fails to acknowledge the intense socialization process that all members of society are subjected to. Therefore, these "natural" phenomenon actually have a social component.

Cultural racism is the blaming of a minority group's disadvantageous social standing on some aspect of that group's culture (for example, the claim that black people experience poverty

because they are lazy). Similar to abstract liberalism, this framework allows dominant groups to ignore systematic racism and instead “blame the victim”.

Finally, minimization of racism stresses the idea that racism is a thing of the past and therefore isn’t impacting minority groups’ success. Whites will often use the excuse that even if some forms of racism do still exist today, it is not nearly as bad as it was in the past. Therefore, minority groups shouldn’t be able to “play the race card” to get ahead in life.

Bonilla-Silva and Dietrich (2011) explain that these four frameworks are not mutually exclusive, rather, they are often used in tandem. Furthermore, the frameworks are flexible because they “do not rely on absolutes”. By providing exceptions (“not all blacks are lazy, but most...”), whites are able to avoid seeming unreasonable and prejudiced. Neville et al (2000) note that those who hold color-blind racial ideologies often do not maintain ideas of racial supremacy. Color-blind racism has an ideological component but lacks an institutional component. That is, color-blind racism is not the belief that whites are superior, but rather the denial that systematic inequality exists.

Who is Color-blind: Demographics

Across studies, scholars have found that certain groups of people are more likely to hold color-blind racial ideologies than others. Bonilla-Silva (2006) examines this matter inversely by analyzing what types of people (among Whites) are most likely to be racial progressives. Bonilla-Silva defines a racial progressive as someone who supports affirmative action and interracial marriage, and as someone who recognizes that discrimination is still a problem in the United States. In his analysis of 1997 interview data from the Survey on Social Attitudes of College Students, Bonilla-Silva found that young, working-class women were the most likely respondents to be racial progressives. He predicts that this due to the fact that women are able to relate to systematic oppression in the form of sexism and are therefore more likely to validate oppression in other forms. Neville et al (2000) found similar results using their Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). Bonilla-Silva (2006) also found that racial progressives were likely to

have these five commonalities: growing up in racially mixed neighborhoods, having minority friends throughout childhood, being politically progressive or radical and having experience with interracial dating.

Likelihood of color-blindness has also been examined between racial groups. Bonilla-Silva and Dietrich (2011) cite a 2009 study done by Kalscheur on perceived equality of opportunities in the United States. In his analysis of data from the Public Opinion on the Courts in the United States survey, Kalscheur found that Blacks and Latinos are increasingly likely to claim that they have equal opportunities for success in the U.S. Specifically, it was found that Latinos were just as likely as non-Hispanic whites to hold colorblind racial ideologies when controlling for social class and race. Manning et al (2015) found similar findings in a quantitative analysis using the Boundaries in the American Mosaic Project (BAM). They found that while Whites are more likely to reject color-blind ideologies than expected, they are still more likely than Blacks to embrace color-blind ideologies. However, when measuring the frames of abstract liberalism and cultural racism, it was found that Blacks and Whites differ less significantly than expected.

Summary

_____ From this literature review, several key trends appear across studies. First, there is a relationship between nationalism, in its various components, and support for English-Only policies. Specifically, those who hold an ethno-cultural criteria of national membership are more likely to support English-Only policy (Freundreis and Tatalovich, 1997; Schildkraut, 2003). This study will retest these findings, however, it will also further our current understanding by including multiple measures of ethno-cultural criteria as well as civic criteria. We will be able to see if certain criteria (racial, linguistic, ethnic, etc.) are more important than others and how holding civic criteria influences English-Only support.

Next, the literature indicates that hostility towards foreign groups, rather than racial groups, is the basis for English-Only support (Freundreis and Tatalovich, 1997). However, no

studies have been done to examine how color-blind racial ideologies, a more covert form of racism, is related to support for English-Only policies. This study will use Bonilla-Silva's (2011) four frames of color-blind racism to determine if the endorsement of such racial ideologies, towards both native racial groups and immigrants, can predict support for English-Only policy.

Finally, the demographic characteristics identified throughout the literature review will be used in this study as control variables. Several of relationships between certain demographics and English-Only support will also be analyzed. Specifically, the relationship between age, education level, identifying as an Evangelical Christian and neighborhood diversity with English-Only support will be examined.

Methodology

This project consists of two main methodological components: 1) an analysis of two pre-existing, nationally representative datasets and 2) an analysis of original data collected using a self-created survey. A complete description of both components is provided below.

Analysis of Secondary Data

Description of the Data

The first dataset analyzed is the 1994 General Social Survey (GSS), distributed by NORC at the University of Chicago. Created in 1972, GSS is a well-known and reputable data source within the Social Sciences. GSS administers a nationally representative survey each year covering an assortment of demographic, attitudinal and behavioral variables. All non-institutionalized adults who speak English or Spanish are allowed to participate in the survey.

One methodological limitation with GSS is an inconsistency of the variables available in each individual survey year. This proved challenging for choosing a relatively recent sample while also assuring that all variables were administered within the same year. As a result, the

year 1994 was chosen for analysis, as it was the year that contained the greatest number of relevant variables. While 1994 is not the most recent data available, it proved to be methodologically beneficial in that, when compared to the two other data sources, it allowed for a comparison of attitudes across the past two decades.

The second preexisting data set analyzed was the 21st Century Americanism: Nationally Representative Survey of the United States Population (referred to as 21st Century Americanism in the remainder of this paper). Developed by the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, 21st Century Americanism is a nationally representative dataset that was distributed in 2004. This dataset was chosen specifically because of its focus on concepts surrounding “Americanism” and attitudes towards foreign-born and minority groups.

Based on an extensive review of the existing literature, variables from 1994 GSS and 21st Century Americanism were selected to measure the concepts of general feelings of nationalism, criteria of national membership and color-blind racial ideologies. A number of demographic control variables were also included in each dataset. An in-depth description of the variables included in each dataset is provided below. A complete list of each variable used and the questions associated with them is provided in Appendix 1.

1994 GSS Variables

Demographic Variables

Within the existing literature on English-Only policies, nationalism and color-blind racial ideologies, nine key demographic variables were identified as influencing attitudes towards these concepts. These nine variables were included to serve as controls in the analysis. First, age was included as it was found to influence perceptions of English-Only support, nationalism and color-blind racial ideologies (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Citrin et al, 1990; Garcia and Bass, 2007). Second, gender (recoded as male identified persons versus all other persons) was included due to the finding that, among whites, men are more likely to endorse color-blind racial ideologies. (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Neville et al, 2000). Third, racial identification (recoded as White identified

persons versus all other persons) was included as it has been found that non-Hispanic Whites are more likely to support English-Only policy (Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997). Fourth, subjective class identification was included as it was found that, contrary to popular belief, those who identified as working-class were the least likely to endorse color-blind racial ideologies (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Fifth, education level was included due to Citrin et al's (1990) finding that education is correlated with perceptions of nationalism. Sixth, political ideology was included as it has been found to influence support for English-Only policies, ideas about nationalism and color-blind racial ideologies (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Citrin et al, 1990; Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997). Seventh, Christian denomination, recoded to measure Evangelical Christianity or not, was included due to Bonikowski and DiMaggio's (2016) finding that religious identification was one of the strongest predictors for which of their four types of nationalists a person is likely to be. Specifically, it was found that Evangelical Christians are most likely to be ardent nationalists. Eighth, a fundamentalist variable was included as a way to further test how fundamentalist religious ideologies impact nationalism and English-Only support. Finally, the diversity of the respondent's neighborhood was included as it was found that growing up in a racially mixed neighborhood is correlated with the rejection of color-blind racial ideologies (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). It is important to note that this final variable is limited for two reasons. First, it looks at the diversity of the respondent's current rather than childhood neighborhood. Second, the variable only questions White respondents about the number of Blacks in their neighborhood and vice versa. All other races are recorded as "Not Applicable". However, it still measures a demographic component similar to Bonilla-Silva's finding, so it was considered appropriate to be included.

Outcome Variable

One outcome variable was chosen to measure attitudes towards English-Only language policies. This variable asked respondents if they are in support or opposition to English being made the official language of the United States. The wording of the question emphasizes the

institutional implications of an English-Only policy, noting that such a policy would result in government business being conducted exclusively in English. It was debated whether or not to include a variable that did not mention these institutional implications in order to capture more personal rather than policy based attitudes. However, greater interest was in how people perceive these specific implications rather than just general support or opposition. Furthermore, additional interpretations of English-Only policies were included in the self-created survey and can be analyzed from this source.

General Feelings of Nationalism (Measured as Pride in the Nation)

For the purposes of this project, general feelings of nationalism are being characterized as pride in the nation. This is mainly due to the limited availability of variables measuring nationalism asked in 1994. Pride has been used to characterize general feelings of nationalism in a multitude of other studies across the social sciences (Meitinger, 2015), and is the concept that many citizens associate with nationalism in everyday rhetoric. However, Meitinger argues that it is inappropriate to reduce nationalism down simply to pride, an argument also supported by the foregoing Literature Review. It is noted that because nationalism is a complex concept, pride in the nation shouldn't be its sole measure. However, because different tenants of nationalism are measured throughout the rest of this study, only measuring pride was considered sufficient for this particular Hypothesis.¹

Color-blind Racial Ideologies

Four variables, each measuring one of Bonilla-Silva's frames of color-blind racism, were included in the dataset to quantify color-blind racial ideologies. The first variable measures support and opposition for affirmative action in the hiring and promotion of Blacks as reparation for past discrimination. Support for affirmative action serves as a measure of abstract liberalism, as it addresses whether people generally embrace meritocratic ideals over equity. Support for

¹ Due to the limited availability of variables per year in GSS, this dataset was not able to incorporate the necessary variables needed to capture criteria of national membership. However, it is tested in other datasets throughout the study.

affirmative action was also used by Bonilla-Silva as one of the criteria for being considered a racial progressive (2006).

The remaining three variables were part of a set that primed respondents with the question: “On the average (Negroes/Blacks/African-Americans) have worse jobs, income, and housing than white people. Do you think these differences are...”. Two of the variables measure minimization of racism by examining if respondents feel that these differences are mainly due to general discrimination and/or a lack of educational opportunities specifically. These variables analyze whether respondents think that discrimination is still impacting minorities’ lives today, or if discrimination is something that doesn’t happen anymore in our nation. Beliefs about education as a way to rise out of poverty also measure abstract liberalism, as it considers the question of whether or not all Americans have the same opportunities for success. The final variable measures the frame of cultural racism by asking respondents whether differences in jobs, housing and income between Blacks and Whites are due to the lifestyle of Blacks (a lack of motivation and will-power) rather than institutional discrimination.²

21st Century Americanism Variables

Demographic Variables

For the sake of consistency, many of the demographic variables included in the 1994 GSS dataset were also included in the 21st Century Americanism dataset. While the scales for the variables differ slightly between GSS and 21st Century Americanism, both datasets generally capture the same ideas. However, there are several differences worth noting. First, subjective class was substituted for income due to no class variable being available in 21st Century Americanism. Additionally, the religion variable for 21st Century Americanism was recoded into Baptist/Southern Baptist or not. Baptist/Southern Baptist was the only group listed that can overwhelmingly be identified as Evangelical Christians (when they’re White). Therefore, it is

² No variable was found in the 1994 GSS dataset that would accurately capture the naturalization of racism. However, naturalization of racism is included in the self-created survey.

important to note that there is some overlap between this variable and the variable measuring White racial identification versus all others. Finally, the variable measuring the racial makeup of the respondent's neighborhood is relevant to more racial groups rather than just Blacks and Whites.

Outcome Variable

The outcome variable used for 21st Century Americanism is essentially identical to the outcome variable used for 1994 GSS. There is only a slight variation in the wording of the question. Rather than claiming that *all* government business would be conducted in English-Only, this variable states that only *some* government business would be conducted in English-Only. The different levels of absoluteness in the language used may have an effect on respondent answers, therefore it may be worth making note of this when looking at any variance between the two datasets.

General Feelings of Nationalism (Measured as Pride in the Nation)

As with the 1994 GSS dataset, pride in the nation is being used to characterize general feelings of nationalism.

Criteria of National Membership

A total of six variables, split between civic and ethno-cultural criteria, are used in this dataset to measure criteria of national membership. The questions associated with the variables asked respondents to identify whether they feel certain traits are important to being a true American. The civic criteria included in this dataset are the pursuit of economic success through hard work, respecting America's political institutions and laws, and being informed about local and national politics. The ethno-cultural criteria included in this dataset are speaking English, being White and being born in the United States.

Color-blind Racial Ideologies (As Applied to Immigrants)

One methodological limitation of 21st Century Americanism is that it does not provide variables that explicitly address racial groups and also align well with Bonilla-Silva's four frames

of color-blind racism. However, 21st Century Americanism does include two variables that apply the frames of color-blindness to immigrant populations. While these variables do not directly reference race, the wording of the questions is analogous to the rationalization behind abstract liberalism and minimization of racism. The first variable compares present day immigrants to the Irish, Italians and Jews of the past, claiming that because these immigrants were able to work their way up, today's immigrants should be able to as well. According to the Department of Homeland Security's 2004 Yearbook of Immigration Statistics, the year 21st Century Americanism was distributed, the greatest number of immigrants were not coming from Europe but rather from Asia and Latin America. Therefore, this question addresses the abstract liberalism framework by claiming that all immigrants, no matter their racial or ethnic identity, have the ability to succeed the "American dream" if they only work hard enough.

The next variable asks respondents whether they feel that discrimination is preventing immigrants from rising out of the lower class. This question uses the frame of minimization of racism, as it asks respondents whether they believe that discrimination is really a serious factor impacting immigrants' life chances. Again, it is important to note that the majority of immigrants that come to the United States are people of color, so even though race is not explicitly mentioned, it is still an important underlying factor.

Furthermore, previous studies have indicated that negative attitudes towards foreign-born groups are correlated with an ethno-cultural criterion of national membership and support for English-Only policies (Bonikowski & DiMaggio, 2016; Citrin et al, 1990; Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997). The fact that these variables reference immigrant groups rather than racial groups doesn't allow for further distinction of whether English-Only support is the result of foreign group hostility or general hostility towards minority groups (Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997). However, testing these variables will still be beneficial for gaining a better understanding of how the overarching ideologies behind color-blind racism are related to English-Only support. If color-blind ideologies do in fact play a role in English-Only support, this finding may then guide

future research focused on further differentiating attitudes towards these two groups and how various forms of covert versus explicit biases are manifested towards them.

Analytic Strategy

The data from 1994 GSS and 21st Century Americanism were analyzed using ordinary least squares (OLS) regression in SPSS. Because many of the variables in the datasets were categorical with more than two levels of responses, these variables were recoded into dummies so that they could be analyzed using regression analysis. The choices behind how these variables were dummied was driven by theory found in the Literature Review. For example, because it was found that Non-Hispanic Whites are likely to have different views on English-Only policy compared to other racial groups (Citrin et al, 1990; Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997), the race variables was recoded as “White Persons” and “All Other Persons”. Next, an OLS regression, while controlling for the demographic variables described above, was run to determine whether general nationalism, criteria of national membership and color-blind racial ideologies are correlated with support for English-Only language policies. The results of each analysis were then compared across the datasets.

Analysis of Originally Collected Data

Description of the Data

The second methodological component of this study was the analysis of data collected using a self-created survey instrument. This component was further broken down into two subsections; an analysis of data collected using online snowball sampling, and an analysis of data collected among various college-level courses. The same survey was used in both subsections. The survey incorporated multiple variables from GSS and 21st Century Americanism. However, it also incorporated variables of original design that were pertinent to this study but not available in either pre-existing dataset. An explanation of the variables included in the survey are provided below. A complete description of the variables is in the Appendix.

Demographic Variables:

Due to the fact that the demographic variables are mainly acting as controls, the demographics included in this survey were essentially identical to those used in the 1994 GSS and 21st Century Americanism datasets. Age, gender, race, class identification, income (of childhood home), education level, political ideology and identification as an Evangelical Christian were all included in this survey. However, several additional variables were tested as well. First, in accordance with the current practice in the Social Sciences, Hispanic/Latino identification was separated from race and instead given its own variable. Next, meaningful relationships with people of other races was included due to Bonilla-Silva's (2006) finding that having Black friends and/or experiences with interracial dating impact endorsement of color-blind racism. Finally, diversity of the respondent's neighborhood was adjusted to specifically ask about their childhood home, in accordance with Bonilla-Silva's (2006) finding that growing up in racially diverse neighborhoods is correlated with less endorsement of color-blind racial ideologies.

Outcome Variable

The outcome variable included in this survey is the same as the outcome variable used in 1994 GSS. It asks respondents to identify whether they support or oppose making English the official language of the United States with the implication that this would impact *all* government business.

General Levels of Nationalism

General feelings of nationalism were measured according to two of Bonikowski and DiMaggio's (2016) four aspects of nationalism: pride in the nation and national identity. These two aspects were chosen based on Citrin et al's (1990) finding that support for English-Only policy is related to a positive attachment to national symbols and a strong national identity. To measure pride, the 1994 GSS pride variable was included in the survey. Counter to this, feelings of shame towards the nation were also explicitly addressed by asking respondents if

there are things about the United States that make them feel ashamed. To measure national identity, respondents were asked to rate how important being an American is to them from a scale of 0 (not at all important) to 5 (the most important thing in their life). Finally, respondents were asked to select whether they would chose to mainly be identified mainly as a particular racial, ethnic or nationality group or as just an American.

Criteria of National Membership

In order to fully capture the concepts of civic and ethno-cultural criteria of national membership, a total of eleven variables were used to assess these attitudes. First, respondents were asked whether they believe that speaking English is an obligation that citizens owe their country. Additionally, respondents were asked whether they feel that it is possible for people who do not share American cultures and traditions to become fully American. The remaining nine variables all followed the same format, asking respondents to determine how important certain ethno-cultural or civic criterion of national membership are to being truly American. The civic criteria of national membership included were: sharing American values, pursuing economic success through hard work, respecting the United State's political institutions and laws, respecting the Constitution and doing volunteer work in one's community. The ethno-cultural criteria of national membership included are: being born in the United States, being White, being a Christian and speaking English.

Color-blind Racial Ideologies

Thirteen variables were used to measure endorsement of color-blind racial ideologies. The first two variables were designed to measure endorsement of the general idea of color-blindness. First, respondents were asked whether or not they consider themselves to be color-blind. Second, respondents were asked whether race is a factor they think about when considering friends or romantic partners. As with 1994 GSS and 21st Century Americanism, the remaining eleven variables chosen were meant to represent one of Bonilla-Silva's four frames of color-blind racism. To measure abstract liberalism, respondents were asked about the

government's obligation to improve Blacks' living standards and affirmative action in job hiring and college admission. To measure naturalization, respondents were asked whether they believe that racial groups naturally gravitate towards people most like themselves and if segregation in neighborhoods and friend groups is caused because of this. The next three questions measure cultural racism by asking respondents whether they feel that the culture Blacks and Hispanics grew up in is what makes it difficult for them to succeed and is the main cause of inequalities in jobs, housing and income. Additionally, respondents were asked whether they agree or disagree that if Blacks and Hispanics would only try harder, they could be just as successful as other people in the U.S. Finally, minimization of racism is measured by asking respondents whether years of discrimination have made it difficult for Blacks to work their way out of the lower class, and if present discrimination is preventing Blacks from succeeding in America.

Participants of Originally Collected Data

Online Data (Snowball Sampling)

One of the methods used for distributing the original survey was snowball sampling on personal social media pages. While snowball sampling does not allow for non-random sampling, it was included to bring a greater diversity in participants that the college sample wouldn't provide. In particular, it allowed for analysis of different age groups and education levels.

Predictably, when compared to demographics from the 2010 Census, the participants in the online survey varied from national statistics. Specifically, the number of women and people between the ages of 18-25 and liberals were skewed in the online data. Therefore, any findings in this dataset can't be generalized to the nation at large. However, they can still be used to help identify which variables have relationships to one another.

College Courses Data

The survey was also distributed among students in twelve college courses at a small, urban, liberal arts university in the Midwest. All courses at this college conducted in English

unless it is specifically a foreign language course. Which courses were chosen for surveying was based partially on class size and also on the desire to have a variety of disciplines represented. Specifically, there was an oversampling of the university's Business School and Natural Science courses, as these areas of study have been found to have the most students with conservative ideologies (Allgood et al, 2010; Edelstein, 1962; Holtzman, 1956; Noguee and Levin, 1958). For liability purposes, no one under the age of 18 was allowed to participate in the survey.

Original Data Collection

Online Data (Snowball Sampling)

To collect the online data, the original survey was distributed using SurveyMonkey, an internet-based survey development tool. The survey was posted on my personal Facebook page, where it was then shared by several members within my social network. Once again, participation was voluntary and all responses were anonymous. The survey was live for approximately one week and a total of 90 responses were collected.

College Courses Data

Data were collected in the college courses using TurningPoint Technologies clicker polling. Questions were displayed on a PowerPoint slideshow and students submitted their responses through individual handheld polling devices. Students were not told specifics about what the survey was intended to study. Participation in the survey was voluntary and all responses were completely anonymous. Clicker IDs could not be traced back to individual respondents. Finally, if students had already taken the survey in a prior class, they were instructed not to take it again to avoid data skewing.

Original Data Analytic Strategy

Online Data (Snowball Sampling)

Data collected from snowball sampling was compiled into a dataset on SPSS and analyzed using OLS regression. Categorical variables of more than two levels were dummy

coded to allow for regression analysis. Again, how variables were dummied was driven by theory found in the Literature Review. The OLS regression was then run to determine whether general nationalism, criteria of national membership and color-blind racial ideologies were correlated with support for English-Only language policies. The results of this survey were then compared to the 1994 GSS and 21st Century Americanism results.

College Courses Data

The data collected in the twelve college courses was analyzed differently than the prior datasets. Due to an error with the data collection tool, responses from the class surveys were recorded anonymously and therefore couldn't be broken down by individuals. Normally, to account for this, multilevel modeling would be used. However, multilevel modeling is an incredibly sophisticated statistical technique that is beyond the scope of this study. Instead, data was analyzed at the class level using means only. After recoding to account for missing data, the mean scores for each ordinal level variable in all twelve courses were compiled into a dataset in SPSS. For categorical level variables, each response was essentially dummied, and the percentages for each category in each class were compiled into the dataset. Then, an OLS regression was run with each class functioning as an individual case.

One of the benefits of class level analysis is that it allows for a comparison among disciplines, providing insight into the ideologies driving these fields of study. However, the main limitation of using this method is that there is an extremely small sample size of twelve cases, potentially skewing the significance in the outputs. Therefore, when interpreting the results of this dataset, it will be important to keep in mind that the small sample size could be playing a factor in the number of the relationships reported.

Hypotheses

Based on the above information and an in-depth examination of the existing literature, eleven hypotheses are proposed:

H₁: According to Citrin et al (1990), feelings of nationalism and national identity were the main determiners between support or opposition to English-Only policies. Therefore, it is predicted that as general feelings of nationalism, measured as pride in the nation, increases, support for English-Only policies will increase.

H₂: Schildkraut (2003) found that those who hold ethno-cultural sentiments of nationalism were more likely to claim that English is a critical component of American identity. Therefore, it is predicted that those who hold an ethno-cultural criteria of national membership are more likely to support English-Only language policies than those who hold a civic view of nationalism.

H₃: Also based on Schildkraut's (2003) findings, it is predicted that those who endorse an ethno-cultural criteria of national membership are more likely to support English-Only language policies, even if they also endorse a civic criteria of national membership.

H₄: Bonikowski and DiMaggio (2016) found that religion, specifically identifying as an Evangelical Christian, was one of the greatest indicators for being an ardent nationalist. As ardent nationalists hold ethno-cultural criteria of national membership, it is predicted that those who identify as an Evangelical Christian are more likely to support English-Only language policies.

H₅: Citrin et al (1990), as cited by Bonikowski (2008), found that people with higher education levels were less likely to endorse ethno-cultural criteria of national membership, such as language. Therefore, it is predicted that as education level increases, support for English-Only language policy will decrease.

H₆: Younger age has been found to correlate with the rejection of ethno-cultural criteria of national membership and color-blind racial ideologies (Bonikowski, 2008; Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Citrin et al, 1990). Therefore it is predicted that those above the age of 25 are more likely to support English-Only language policies.

H₇: Studies have shown that negative feelings towards immigrants, both legal and illegal, is correlated with an ethno-cultural criteria of national membership and support for English-Only policies (Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997; Garcia and Bass, 2007). Therefore, it is predicted that those who express concern about immigrants are more likely to support English-Only language policies.

H₈: Because a major component of color-blind racism is the desire for unity at the expense of ethno-cultural diversity (Aleinikoff, 1991; Dovidio et al, 2009; Hehman et al, 2012, Neville et al, 2000), it is possible that people who hold color-blind racial ideologies will also support English-Only policies as a way to further promote unity. Therefore, it is hypothesized that the endorsement of color-blind racial ideologies is correlated with increased support for English-Only language policies.

H₉: Bonilla-Silva (2006) found that those who grow up in racially diverse neighborhoods are more likely to reject color-blind racial ideologies. Therefore, because it is predicted that those who hold color-blind racial ideologies are more likely to support English-Only policies, by extension it is predicted that those who grew up in racially diverse neighborhoods are less likely to support English-Only language policies.

H₁₀: Also based on Bonilla-Silva's (2006) finding mentioned above, it is predicted that those who *currently* live in racially diverse neighborhoods are also less likely to support English-Only language policies.

H₁₁: Frendreis and Tatalovich (1997) found that non-Hispanic White conservatives are more likely to support English-Only policies. Additionally, it has been found that students within the natural sciences and business are more likely to be conservative (Allgood et al, 2010; Edelstein, 1962; Holtzman, 1956; Noguee and Levin, 1958). Therefore, it is hypothesized that the same findings will be found among the college course data. That is, it is predicted that

conservative ideologies will be correlated with greater support of English-Only policy within the

colle

ge

cours

es

data.

3

1994 GSS Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
age_recode	2986	71.00	18.00	89.00	45.9692	17.05049
polviews_recode	2879	6.00	1.00	7.00	4.1702	1.38950
educ_recode	2981	19.00	1.00	20.00	13.1754	2.93368
white	2992	1.00	.00	1.00	.8299	.37580
class_recode	2974	3.00	1.00	4.00	2.5212	.64482
raclive_recode	2834	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.3578	.47944
male	2992	1.00	.00	1.00	.4311	.49532
evangelicalchristian	1766	1.00	.00	1.00	.3488	.47673
fund_recode	2846	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.0531	.77595
Valid N (listwise)	1594					

21st Century Americanism Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
ideology_recode	2638	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.8571	.78793
education_recode	2790	6.00	1.00	7.00	3.7892	1.85588
white	2768	1.00	.00	1.00	.6113	.48755
income_recode	2511	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.3843	.48653
evangelicalchristian	2695	1.00	.00	1.00	.0872	.28218
male	2800	1.00	.00	1.00	.4311	.49531
raclive_white	2780	1.00	.00	1.00	.4532	.49790
racliv_black	2780	1.00	.00	1.00	.0475	.21271
raclive_latino	2780	1.00	.00	1.00	.0835	.27662
racliv_asian	2780	1.00	.00	1.00	.0137	.11613
raclive_multiethnic	2780	1.00	.00	1.00	.4022	.49042
Valid N (listwise)	2281					

3 The following four tables show the descriptive statistics for each dataset.

Online Data Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
age	90	7	1	8	3.16	2.664
male	90	1	0	1	.22	.418
white	90	1.00	.00	1.00	.8667	.34184
hispanicity	90	1	0	1	.03	.181
subj_class	90	3	1	4	2.58	.653
hincome_recode	79	7.00	1.00	8.00	4.5823	1.74391
educ	90	6	2	8	4.46	1.113
polviews_recode	82	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.7561	.79444
evangelical_recode	87	1.00	.00	1.00	.3448	.47807
justworld	90	3	1	4	2.23	.925
racerelete_recode	90	4	1	5	4.24	.754
hooddiverse_recode	90	2	1	3	1.30	.589
Valid N (listwise)	70					

College Course Data Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
age	12	.33	1.00	1.33	1.0692	.11074
male	12	44.21	18.75	62.96	41.3025	14.91821
white	12	33.87	50.00	83.87	71.4942	9.09486
hispanic	12	18.18	.00	18.18	8.8225	4.52838
subj.class	12	.44	2.44	2.88	2.7043	.14734
income	12	2.03	3.89	5.92	5.1883	.55081
education	12	.92	3.05	3.97	3.6467	.26186
ideology	12	.95	1.82	2.77	2.3778	.24386
conservative	12	36.36	.00	36.36	12.5525	9.57845
evangelicalchristian	12	21.25	10.00	31.25	18.5817	6.01847
justworld	12	1.11	3.13	4.23	3.7863	.32069
racerelete	12	.62	1.40	2.02	1.7581	.19650
hooddiverse	12	.48	2.15	2.63	2.4088	.16525
Valid N (listwise)	12					

Results

1994 GSS Data

General Nationalism Table

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	67.596	10	6.760	10.011	.000 ^b
	Residual	500.314	741	.675		
	Total	567.910	751			

a. Dependent Variable: engoffcl_recode

b. Predictors: (Constant), fund_recode, amproud_recode, male, ractive_recode, polviews_recode, class_recode, age_recode, white, educ_recode, evangelicalchristian

Table**Coefficients^a**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	1.854	.333		5.570	.000	1.200	2.507
	amproud_recode	.101	.044	.082	2.287	.022	.014	.188
	age_recode	-.006	.002	-.124	-3.311	.001	-.010	-.003
	polviews_recode	-.079	.023	-.122	-3.412	.001	-.125	-.034
	educ_recode	.016	.012	.051	1.354	.176	-.007	.040
	white	-.408	.082	-.190	-4.947	.000	-.570	-.246
	class_recode	.035	.051	.025	.687	.492	-.064	.134
	ractive_recode	.047	.065	.026	.727	.467	-.080	.175
	male	-.079	.061	-.045	-1.299	.194	-.199	.040
	evangelicalchristian	-.279	.081	-.154	-3.447	.001	-.437	-.120
	fund_recode	.144	.046	.140	3.139	.002	.054	.234

a. Dependent Variable: engoffcl_recode

Table 2:

Tables 1 and 2 show the outputs for the 1994 GSS data measuring the relationship between general feelings of nationalism (measured as pride in the nation) and support for English-Only language policies. Table 1, the ANOVA table, depicts how well the regression equation fits the 1994 GSS Data. The regression equation fits that data statistically significantly at .000^b (statistical significance is designated as anything equal to or below .05). That is, the independent variables statistically significantly predict the dependent variable. The null

hypothesis, that there is no relationship between the dependent and independent variables, can confidently be rejected.

Table 2, the Coefficients Table, indicates whether or not each predictor variable is statistically significant, and how much variation each of these variables is responsible for in the model. Table 2 shows that the proudness measure (amproud) is statistically significant at .022, even when controlling for various demographic variables. Therefore, we can confidently reject the null hypothesis. The coefficient for the proudness variable is .101, indicating that for every unit increase in the the proudness measure, there is a .101 unit increase in the English-Only measurement (engoffcl). That is, those who are less proud to be an American are also more likely to oppose English-Only language policies. This finding is consistent with the existing literature (Citrin et al 1990) and supports Hypothesis 1.

Table 2 also shows that age is statistically significant to the model at .001. For every unit increase in age, there is a .006 decrease in the English-Only measure. That is, as age increases, support for English-Only language policies increases. This finding is consistent with the previous literature (Bonikowski, 2008; Citrin et al, 1990) and supports Hypothesis 8. However, it is important to note that the degree of impact of the variable age on English-Only policy support is particularly small compared to other controls.

Identifying as an Evangelical Christian is also statistically significant at .001 with a relatively large coefficient of -.279.. For every unit increase in the Evangelical Christian model, there is a .279 decrease in the English-Only model. That is, those who identify as an Evangelical Christian are more likely to favor English-Only language policies. This finding is consistent with the theories with the existing literature and supports Hypothesis 4. Surprisingly, the fundamentalism measure is also statistically significant at .002, but has a different relationship with the English-Only measure than Evangelical Christianity does. For every unit increase in the fundamentalism measure, there is a .144 increase in the English-Only measure.

That is, those who identify with a more fundamentalist religion are more likely to *oppose* English-Only language policies.

Table 2 also shows that political ideology and race have a significant relationship with English-Only support. However, there is a particularly strong relationship between identifying as White (as opposed to all other races) and support for English-Only language policies. For every unit increase in the Whiteness measure, there is a .408 decrease in the English-Only measure. That is, those who identify as White are more likely to favor English-Only language policies. This finding is consistent with the existing literature (Citrin et al, 1990; Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997; Garcia and Bass, 2007).

Education level and racial diversity of the respondent's current neighborhood are not statistically significant and therefore can't support Hypotheses 5 or 9. Additionally, subjective class level and identifying as a male are also not statistically significant.

Color-blind Ideologies Table

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	59.102	13	4.546	7.273	.000 ^b
	Residual	244.414	391	.625		
	Total	303.516	404			

a. Dependent Variable: engoffcl_recode

b. Predictors: (Constant), fund_recode, racdif1_recode, male, class_recode, age_recode, polviews_recode, ractive_recode, racdif4_recode, racdif3_recode, educ_recode, affrmact_recode, white, evangelicalchristian

Table

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.779	.458	6.071	.000	1.879	3.680
	affrmact_recode	-.183	.050	-.212	.000	-.281	-.085
	racdif1_recode	-.105	.100	-.059	.298	-.302	.093
	racdif3_recode	-.034	.089	-.020	.700	-.209	.140
	racdif4_recode	-.186	.088	-.106	.035	-.358	-.013
	age_recode	-.009	.003	-.166	.001	-.014	-.004
	polviews_recode	-.063	.031	-.098	.041	-.123	-.003
	educ_recode	.016	.017	.047	.359	-.018	.049
	white	-.109	.131	-.051	.403	-.366	.147
	class_recode	-.009	.067	-.007	.892	-.140	.122
	raclive_recode	.144	.087	.078	.100	-.028	.315
	male	-.070	.081	-.040	.386	-.230	.089
	evangelicalchristian	-.253	.111	-.141	.023	-.471	-.035
	fund_recode	.184	.061	.182	.003	.064	.304

a. Dependent Variable: engoffcl_recode

Table

Tables 3 and 4 show the outputs for the 1994 GSS data testing the relationship between color-blind racial ideologies and support for English-Only language policies. Again, Table 3 indicates how well the data fits the regression equation. The model is statistically significant at .000^b, meaning that the independent variables statistically significantly predict the dependent variable and the null hypothesis can be rejected.

Table 4 indicates that two of the four variables used to measure color-blind racial ideologies are statistically significant. The affirmative action measure (affrmact)⁴ is statistically significant at .000. For every unit increase in the affirmative action measure, there is a .183 decrease in the English-Only measure. That is, those who oppose affirmative action are more likely to favor English-Only language policies. The cultural racism measure (racdif4) was also statistically significant at .035. For every unit increase in the cultural racism measure, there is a .186 decrease in the English-Only measure. That is, those who endorse the cultural racism frame of color-blind ideology are more likely to favor English-Only language policies. The

⁴ Measuring the abstract liberalism frame

minimization of racism measures (racdif1 and racdif3) were not found to be statistically significant. Therefore, Hypothesis 8 is partially supported in this model.

Table 4 also shows that, consistent with Table 2, age is statistically significant at .001. For every unit increase in age, there is a .009 decrease in the English-Only measure. That is, as age increases, the more likely you are to favor English-Only language policies. Once again, Hypothesis 6 is supported, but the impact of age on the model is still relatively small at .009.

Identifying as an Evangelical Christian is also statistically significant once again at .023. For every unit increase in the Evangelical Christian measure, there is a relatively large decrease of .253 in the English-Only measure. This indicates that those who identify as an Evangelical Christian are more likely to favor English-Only language policies, supporting Hypothesis 4. The fundamentalism variable also behaved in a similar way in this model. Consistent with Table 2, for every unit increase in the fundamentalism measure, there is a .184 increase in the English-Only measure, indicating that those who practice more fundamental religions are more likely to oppose English-Only language policies.

Education levels and racial diversity of the respondent's variable were not found to be statistically significant, and therefore Hypotheses 5 and 9 cannot be supported in this model. Additionally, identifying as White, subjective class level, and identifying as male were not found to be statistically significant.

21st Century Americanism Data

General Nationalism Table

ANOVA^a

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	166.347	11	15.122	24.601	.000 ^b
Residual	1263.840	2056	.615		
Total	1430.187	2067			

a. Dependent Variable: engoff_recode

b. Predictors: (Constant), raclive_latino, proud_recode, male, racliv_black, income_recode, evangelicalchristian, white, ideology_recode, raclive_multiethnic, education_recode, raclive_white

Table

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	1.270	.195	6.503	.000	.887	1.653
	proud_recode	.189	.036	.117	5.318	.119	.259
	ideology_recode	.210	.023	.198	8.962	.164	.256
	education_recode	-.026	.011	-.056	-2.464	-.047	-.005
	income_recode	.115	.039	.066	2.957	.039	.191
	white	-.257	.039	-.145	-6.589	-.333	-.180
	evangelicalchristian	-.059	.061	-.021	-.963	-.178	.061
	male	-.037	.035	-.022	-1.034	-.106	.033
	raclive_white	-.311	.173	-.187	-1.795	-.651	.029
	raclive_multiethnic	-.256	.174	-.151	-1.474	-.596	.085
	racliv_black	-.246	.192	-.060	-1.280	-.622	.131
	raclive_latino	-.077	.185	-.022	-.414	-.439	.286

a. Dependent Variable: engoff_recode

Table

Tables 5 and 6 show the outputs for the 21st Century Americanism data testing the relationship between general levels of nationalism (measured as pride in the nation) and support for English-Only language policies. Table 5 indicates that the regression model fits the data and is statistically significant at .000^b, meaning that there is a significant relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The null hypothesis can be rejected.

Table 6 indicates that the proud measure (proud), is statistically significant at .000. For every unit increase in the proudness measure, there is a .189 increase in the English-Only measure (engoff). That is, those who are less proud to be an American are more likely to oppose English-Only language policies. This finding is consistent with the 1994 GSS data and supports Hypothesis 1.

Education level is also statistically significant at .014. For every unit increase in education levels, there is a .026 decrease in the English-Only measure. For this variable, education is coded so that a lower value is associated with a higher level of education. The coefficient is relatively small, but indicates that those with less education are more likely to favor English-Only language policy. This finding is consistent with the existing literature (Bonikowski, 2008; Citrin et al, 1990) and supports Hypothesis 5.

The neighborhood diversity measure (raclive) was dummied into five separate variables based on what race is the majority in the respondent's neighborhood. The dummy variable associated with predominantly Asian neighborhoods was removed from the analysis due to multicollinearity and a low sample size. However, even with the removal of this measure, none of the other neighborhood diversity measures are statistically significant. Living in predominantly White neighborhoods is marginally statistical significance at .073, but Hypothesis 9 cannot be supported in this model.

Unlike the 1994 GSS data, identifying as an Evangelical Christian is not statistically significant in this model. Consequently, Hypothesis 4 cannot be supported by this data. Identifying as a male is also not statistically significant in this model. However, political ideology, income and identifying as White are statistically significant. Political ideology and identifying as White have relatively large impacts on the model with coefficients of .210 and -.257. The table indicates that those with more liberal political ideologies are more likely to oppose English-Only language policies. This finding is consistent with the existing literature (Bonikowski, 2008; Citrin et al, 1990; Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997). Also, consistent with the existing literature (Citrin et al, 1990; Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997; Garcia and Bass, 2007), the Table 6 indicates that those who identify as White are more likely to favor English-Only language policies.

Criteria of National Membership Data

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	322.823	16	20.176	35.881	.000 ^b
	Residual	1201.654	2137	.562		
	Total	1524.477	2153			

a. Dependent Variable: engoff_recode

b. Predictors: (Constant), raclive_multiethnic, amworkall_recode, male, white, evangelicalchristian, amwhiteall_recode, amlawsall_recode, income_recode, ideology_recode, aminfoall_recode, raclive_latino, racliv_black, ambornall_recode, amengall_recode, education_recode, raclive_white

Table

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	.588	.198	2.966	.003	.199	.977
	amworkall_recode	.047	.023	2.055	.040	.002	.092
	amlawsall_recode	.037	.033	1.130	.258	-.027	.101
	aminfoall_recode	.005	.027	.171	.864	-.049	.058
	amwhiteall_recode	-.014	.023	-.621	.535	-.060	.031
	amengall_recode	.386	.028	14.006	.000	.332	.441
	ambornall_recode	.063	.016	3.819	.000	.031	.095
	ideology_recode	.132	.022	5.959	.000	.089	.176
	education_recode	.009	.010	.865	.387	-.011	.029
	income_recode	.151	.037	4.085	.000	.079	.224
	white	-.284	.036	-7.894	.000	-.355	-.214
	evangelicalchristian	-.070	.060	-1.169	.243	-.187	.047
	male	-.066	.033	-1.984	.047	-.131	-.001
	raclive_white	-.171	.153	-1.122	.262	-.470	.128
	racliv_black	-.008	.171	-.046	.964	-.343	.327
	raclive_latino	.101	.161	.624	.533	-.216	.417
	raclive_multiethnic	-.104	.152	-.682	.495	-.403	.195

a. Dependent Variable: engoff_recode

Table

Tables 7 and 8 show the outputs for the 21st Century Americanism data testing the relationship between criteria of national membership and support for English-Only language policies. Table 7 indicates that the regression model fits the data and is statistically significant at .000^b. The null hypothesis can be rejected.

Table 8 shows that two of the three variables used to measure ethno-cultural criteria of national membership are statistically significant. Predictably, the speaking English measure (amengall) is statistically significant at .000 and has a large coefficient of .386. That is, those who believe that speaking English is *not* important to being a true American are more likely to oppose English-Only language policies. This finding is consistent with the existing literature (Citrin et al, 1990; Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997; Schildkraut, 2003).

The U.S. born measure (ambornall) is also statistically significant at .000 with a coefficient of .063. This indicates that those who believe that being born in the US in *not*

important to being a true American are more likely to oppose English-Only language policies. However, the Whiteness measure (amwhiteall) was not statistically significant. There is no relationship between believing that being White is important to being a true American and support for English-Only language policies. Therefore, this model shows that some ethno-cultural traits are important while others are not, but overall there is support for Hypothesis 2.

Table 8 indicates that only one of the three variables used to measure civic criteria of nationalism is statistically significant. The work ethic measure (amworkall) is statistically significant at .040. For every unit increase in the work ethic measure, there is a .047 increase in the English-Only measure. That is, those who believe that pursuing economic success through hard work is *not* important to being a true American are more likely to oppose English-Only language policies. However, the impact of this variable is relatively small. The other variables, measuring respect for the law (amlawsall) and knowledge about politics (aminfoall) are not statistically significant.

Unlike Table 6, Education level is not statistically significant in this model and Hypothesis 5 cannot be supported. Identifying as an Evangelical Christian and the racial diversity of the respondent's neighborhood were also not found to be statistically significant, contradicting Hypotheses 4 and 9. However, political ideology, income, identifying as White and identifying as male are all statistically significant. The Whiteness measure in particular has a large coefficient of -.284. This indicates that those who identify as White are more likely to favor English-Only language policies. This is consistent with the findings in Table 6 as well as the existing literature (Citrin et al, 1990; Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997; Garcia and Bass, 2007).

Color-blind Racial Ideologies (Applied to Immigrants) Data

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	197.124	13	15.163	24.734	.000 ^b
	Residual	1202.835	1962	.613		
	Total	1399.959	1975			

a. Dependent Variable: engoff_recode

b. Predictors: (Constant), raclive_multiethnic, income_recode, ideology_recode, male, white, evangelicalchristian, prej.immigrants_recode, dis.immigrants_recode, racliv_black, raclive_latino, education_recode, CB_index, raclive_white

Table 9.**Coefficients^a**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	1.931	.198		9.756	.000	1.543	2.320
	CB_index	.005	.010	.011	.474	.635	-.015	.025
	prej.immigrants_recode	-.100	.018	-.124	-5.737	.000	-.135	-.066
	dis.immigrants_recode	-.104	.017	-.134	-6.047	.000	-.137	-.070
	ideology_recode	.160	.024	.149	6.713	.000	.113	.207
	education_recode	-.017	.011	-.036	-1.527	.127	-.038	.005
	white	-.208	.043	-.119	-4.852	.000	-.292	-.124
	income_recode	.172	.040	.098	4.271	.000	.093	.250
	evangelicalchristian	-.095	.066	-.032	-1.450	.147	-.223	.034
	male	-.034	.036	-.020	-.948	.343	-.105	.036
	raclive_white	-.281	.157	-.166	-1.793	.073	-.588	.026
	racliv_black	-.196	.177	-.048	-1.110	.267	-.542	.150
	raclive_latino	.061	.166	.020	.369	.712	-.264	.387
	raclive_multiethnic	-.207	.156	-.120	-1.325	.185	-.514	.100

a. Dependent Variable: engoff_recode

Table 10:

Tables 9 and 10 show the outputs for the 21st Century Americanism dataset testing the relationship between color-blind racial ideologies (as they are applied to immigrants) and support for English-Only language policies. Table 9 indicates that the regression model statistically significantly fits the data at .000^b. The null hypothesis can be rejected.

Table 10 shows that both independent variables are statistically significant. The prej.immigrants variable is statistically significant at .000 with a coefficient of -.100. This indicates that those who believe today's immigrants should be able to overcome prejudice like

past immigrants are more likely to favor English-Only language policies. The *dis.immigrants* variable is also statistically significant at .000 with a coefficient of $-.104$. This indicates that those who disagree that years of discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for immigrants to work their way out of the lower class are more likely to favor English-Only language policies. These findings are consistent with the existing literature about attitudes towards immigrants (Garcia and Bass, 2007; Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997) and support Hypothesis 7. Additionally, even though the variables are not applied specifically to racial groups, this model supports the prediction in Hypothesis 8 that endorsement of color-blind ideologies is related to greater support for English-Only policies.

Similar to Table 8, neither higher education levels, identifying as an Evangelical Christian or the racial majority of the respondent's neighborhood are statistically significant in Table 10. Therefore, Hypotheses 4, 5 and 9 cannot be supported in this model. Additionally, identifying as male is also not shown to be statistically significant. However, political ideology, income and identifying as White were all found to be statistically significant once again, with the White variable having a large coefficient of $-.208$. As with Tables 6 and 8, this output indicates that those who identify as White are more likely to favor English-Only language policies and is consistent with the existing literature (Citrin et al, 1990; ; Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997; Garcia and Bass, 2007).

Summary of Nationally Representative Datasets

Overall, there is notable overlap between the outputs of the 1994 GSS and 2004 21st Century Americanism datasets, and it is important to document these similarities across time. These similarities suggest that the different levels of "absoluteness" in each English-Only measure ("all government business" versus "some government business") was not a significant factor when determining support for English-Only policy.

Even when controlling for various demographic variables, both datasets indicate that there is a significant relationship between pride in being an American and support for English-Only policy. As pride increases, so does support for English-Only language policy, supporting Hypothesis 1 of this study. This finding is in line with Citrin et al's (1990) finding that a strong national identity and positive attachment to national symbols, two measures comparable to pride, are correlated with favoring of English-Only law.

Additionally, both GSS and 21st Century Americanism indicate that an endorsement of abstract liberalism, whether applied to Blacks or today's immigrants, is correlated with increased support of English-Only policy. Several of the other frames were significant as well, but abstract liberalism is the only frame that is significant across both datasets.

Because there were no relevant variables to test criteria of national membership using the GSS data, this hypothesis cannot be compared between 1994 GSS and 21st Century Americanism. However, the results of the 21st Century Americanism data indicated that endorsement of ethno-cultural criteria of national membership is related to greater support of English-Only laws, even when controlling for endorsement of civic criteria. Therefore, Hypotheses 2 and 3 are supported in this model.

Finally, one control variable that remains significant throughout all five 1994 GSS and 21st Century Americanism models is political ideology. In each model, there is a significant relationship between opposition towards English-Only policy and a more liberal political orientation. Within the literature review, political ideology was found to impact attitudes towards English-Only policy, nationalism and color-blind racial ideologies. Specifically, this finding is consistent with Frensdreis and Tatalovich's (1997) finding that conservative ideologies are related to the favoring of English-Only policy.

Online Survey Data (Snowball Sampling)

General Nationalism Data

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	39.719	16	2.482	2.396	.010 ^b
	Residual	49.728	48	1.036		
	Total	89.446	64			

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw_recode

b. Predictors: (Constant), hooddiverse_recode, importam_recode, educ, evangelical_recode, racerelate_recode, identity_recode, hincome_recode, male, justworld, white, age, hispanicity, usashamed, subj_class, polviews_recode, proudam_recode

Table

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	6.305	2.283		2.761	.008	1.714	10.895
	proudam_recode	-.138	.256	-.118	-.538	.593	-.652	.377
	importam_recode	-.173	.152	-.202	-1.142	.259	-.479	.132
	usashamed	-.433	.249	-.364	-1.736	.089	-.934	.068
	identity_recode	-.030	.248	-.017	-.123	.903	-.530	.469
	age	.108	.074	.238	1.471	.148	-.040	.256
	male	.194	.374	.068	.519	.606	-.558	.945
	white	-.294	.556	-.073	-.529	.599	-1.412	.824
	hispanicity	1.714	.888	.307	1.930	.060	-.072	3.501
	subj_class	.178	.266	.103	.669	.507	-.356	.712
	hincome_recode	-.116	.105	-.162	-1.103	.275	-.327	.095
	educ	-.102	.136	-.091	-.751	.457	-.376	.172
	polviews_recode	.517	.303	.346	1.706	.095	-.092	1.127
	evangelical_recode	.037	.348	.015	.108	.915	-.662	.737
	justworld	.005	.182	.004	.028	.978	-.361	.371
	racerelate_recode	-.288	.194	-.182	-1.486	.144	-.678	.102
	hooddiverse_recode	-.186	.304	-.098	-.612	.543	-.796	.425

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw_recode

Table

Tables 11 and 12 show the outputs for the online survey data (distributed via snowball sampling) testing the relationship between general levels of nationalism and support for English-

Only language policies. Table 11 indicates that the regression model statistically significantly fits the model at .010^b and we can reject the null hypothesis that there is no relationship.

None of the variables in Table 12 are statistically significant, potentially due to the small sample size. However, it is worth noting that the shame measure (usashamed) is marginally statistically significant at .089, but it has a large coefficient of -.433. This indicates that those who report not being ashamed of the United States are more likely to support English-Only policy.

Identifying as Hispanic was also marginally statistically significant at .06, but has a very large coefficient of 1.714. This indicates that those who identify as Hispanic are more likely to favor English-Only language policies. This finding is contradictory to the existing literature (Citrin et al, 1990; Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997). However, within the sample only three respondents identified as Hispanic/Latino so this finding is not generalizable. Of these three respondents, all of them identify as conservative, which has been found to have a significant relationship with English-Only support in all of the preceding models. Finally, political ideology was also marginally statistically significant at .095 with a coefficient of .517. This indicates once again that those who identify as liberal are more likely to oppose English-Only language policies.

Criteria of

National

Membership

Data

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	58.316	23	2.535	3.103	.001 ^b
	Residual	29.418	36	.817		
	Total	87.733	59			

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw_recode

b. Predictors: (Constant), hooddiverse_recode, engoblig_recode, educ, racerelate_recode, vol_truam_recode, evangelical_recode, const_truam_recode, wht_truam_recode, subj_class, white, sharecustoms_recode, male, justworld, chst_truam_recode, usborn_truam_recode, age, econ_truam_recode, hincome_recode, hispanicity, polviews_recode, amval_truam_recode, eng_truam_recode, laws_truam_recode

Table 13:

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	3.208	1.712		1.874	.069	-.265	6.680
	engoblig_recode	.484	.319	.252	1.516	.138	-.163	1.131
	usborn_truam_recode	.312	.240	.209	1.300	.202	-.175	.799
	whl_truam_recode	-.025	.365	-.009	-.069	.946	-.765	.715
	chst_truam_recode	-.184	.296	-.098	-.621	.539	-.784	.416
	amval_truam_recode	-.056	.237	-.043	-.238	.813	-.537	.424
	eng_truam_recode	.450	.274	.349	1.644	.109	-.105	1.006
	econ_truam_recode	-.069	.217	-.049	-.318	.752	-.508	.371
	laws_truam_recode	-.162	.345	-.103	-.470	.642	-.861	.537
	const_truam_recode	-.184	.386	-.090	-.478	.636	-.967	.598
	vol_truam_recode	.066	.178	.046	.371	.713	-.295	.427
	sharecustoms_recode	.001	.117	.001	.009	.993	-.236	.238
	age	.031	.068	.065	.456	.651	-.107	.169
	male	.057	.408	.019	.140	.890	-.771	.885
	white	-.208	.521	-.052	-.400	.692	-1.265	.848
	hispanicity	1.216	.811	.219	1.500	.142	-.428	2.860
	subj_class	.185	.294	.106	.629	.533	-.411	.781
	hincome_recode	-.085	.107	-.120	-.792	.434	-.301	.132
	educ	-.127	.123	-.115	-1.034	.308	-.375	.122
	polviews_recode	.600	.251	.388	2.388	.022	.090	1.109
	evangelical_recode	.069	.359	.027	.191	.850	-.660	.797
	justworld	-.267	.191	-.204	-1.397	.171	-.655	.121
	racerate_recode	-.151	.188	-.095	-.802	.428	-.532	.230
	hooddiverse_recode	-.447	.298	-.233	-1.501	.142	-1.051	.157

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw_recode

Table

Tables 13 and 14 show the outputs for the online survey data testing the relationship between criteria of national membership and support for English-Only language policies. Table 13 indicates that the regression model fits the table and is statistically significant at .001^b and the null hypothesis can be rejected.

Table 14 shows that the ethnocultural criteria measures (engoblig, usborn_truam and eng_truam) are marginally statistically significant and have relatively large coefficients. Comparatively, the civic criteria measures are not close to statistical significance and have generally have small coefficients. This trend indicates that holding ethno-cultural criteria of national membership has a greater relationship to support for English-Only policy than civic criteria. Furthermore, even when controlling for civic criteria, the ethno-cultural criteria are still marginally statistically significant. Therefore, Hypotheses 2 and 3 are supported in this model.

Table 14 shows that only one demographic variable, polviews, is statistically significant at .022 with a large coefficient of .600. This indicates that those who identify as liberal are more likely to favor English-Only language policies. This finding is contradictory to the secondary datasets examined above as well as the existing literature (Bonikowski, 2008; Citrin et al, 1990; Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997).

Color-blind Racial Ideologies Data

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	59.316	26	2.281	3.042	.001 ^b
	Residual	27.002	36	.750		
	Total	86.317	62			

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw_recode

b. Predictors: (Constant), hoodddiverse_recode, cultracism1, evangelical_recode, racerelate_recode, educ, naturalfrnds, hincome_recode, discrimdif2, naturalhood, colblind, white, cb_partners, age, minimization, male, naturalpref, discrimdif, justworld, subj_class, coll_afmact, polviews_recode, hispanicity, cultracism2, discrimdif3, helpblks, affmact_recode

Table 15:

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	3.641	1.931		1.885	.067	-.276	7.558
	colblind	.209	.203	.138	1.031	.309	-.202	.621
	cb_partners	-.283	.163	-.258	-1.732	.092	-.614	.048
	helpblks	.058	.231	.063	.251	.803	-.411	.528
	affrmact_recode	.167	.319	.160	.525	.603	-.479	.813
	coll_afmact	-.391	.288	-.395	-1.355	.184	-.976	.194
	naturalhood	-.084	.154	-.071	-.547	.588	-.397	.229
	naturalfrnds	.425	.175	.351	2.425	.020	.070	.780
	naturalpref	-.646	.357	-.253	-1.808	.079	-1.371	.078
	cult racism1	.383	.137	.384	2.799	.008	.105	.660
	cult racism2	.246	.195	.238	1.261	.215	-.150	.642
	discrimdif	-.473	.396	-.182	-1.194	.240	-1.275	.330
	discrimdif2	-.077	.196	-.072	-.395	.695	-.475	.320
	discrimdif3	-.211	.506	-.085	-.418	.678	-1.237	.814
	minimization	.090	.211	.065	.425	.673	-.339	.519
	age	.045	.065	.101	.699	.489	-.086	.177
	male	-.291	.373	-.103	-.780	.440	-1.047	.465
	white	-1.243	.552	-.312	-2.251	.031	-2.363	-.123
	hispanicity	.206	.901	.037	.229	.821	-1.621	2.032
	subj_class	.216	.245	.127	.880	.384	-.281	.712
	hincome_recode	-.037	.096	-.052	-.387	.701	-.232	.157
	educ	-.074	.127	-.069	-.583	.563	-.332	.184
	polviews_recode	.273	.292	.181	.932	.357	-.320	.865
	evangelical_recode	.289	.318	.113	.911	.368	-.355	.934
	justworld	-.389	.182	-.306	-2.133	.040	-.758	-.019
	racerate_recode	.042	.181	.027	.233	.817	-.325	.409
	hooddiverse_recode	-.439	.270	-.235	-1.628	.112	-.987	.108

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw_recode

Table 16:

Tables 15 and 16 show the outputs for the self-created survey data testing the relationship between color-blind racial ideologies and support for English-Only language policies. Table 15 indicates that the regression model fits the data statistically significantly at .001^b. The null hypothesis can be rejected.

Table 16 shows that, of Bonilla-Silva's (2011) four frames of color-blind racism, naturalization of racism and cultural racism are the two most significant frames. The segregated friend groups measure (naturalfrnds) is statistically significant at .020 with a large coefficient of .425. This indicates that those who believe that friend groups are segregated because of natural preferences are more likely to favor English-Only language policies. Additionally, the general

racial preference measure (naturalpref) is marginally statistically significant at .079 with a large coefficient of -.646. This indicates that those who believe that all racial groups prefer to be surrounded by people most like themselves are more likely to oppose English-Only language policies.

The cultural racism measure (cultracism1) was statistically significant at .008 with a coefficient of .383. That is, for every unit increase in the cultural racism measure, there is a .383 increase in the English-Only measure (engonlylaw). This indicates that those who believe that the culture that Blacks and Hispanics grew up in is what makes it difficult for them to succeed are more likely to favor English-Only language policies.

Table 16 also indicates that identifying as White and belief in a just world are statistically significant at .031 and .040. The White variable specifically has a very large coefficient of -1.243. That is, for every unit increase in the Whiteness measure, there is a 1.243 decrease in the English-Only measure. Once again, the model indicates that those who identify as White are significantly more likely to favor English-Only language policies. This finding suggests that race, rather than ethnicity, is more important when determining support for English-Only policy.

College Courses Data

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.742	9	.194	31.399	.031 ^b
	Residual	.012	2	.006		
	Total	1.754	11			

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw

b. Predictors: (Constant), hooddiverse, conservative, identity, age, usashamed, proudam, evangelicalchristian, importanceam, education

General Nationalism Data

Coefficients ^a								
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	-9.656	2.061		-4.684	.043	-18.525	-.787
	proudam	1.893	.335	1.400	5.657	.030	.453	3.332
	importanceam	1.503	.287	1.284	5.238	.035	.269	2.738
	usashamed	.118	.273	.081	.434	.707	-1.055	1.292
	identity	-.431	.162	-.347	-2.655	.117	-1.130	.268
	age	-.275	.366	-.076	-.751	.531	-1.851	1.301
	education	-.154	.398	-.101	-.387	.736	-1.867	1.559
	conservative	-.017	.009	-.412	-1.820	.210	-.058	.023
	evangelicalchristian	-.019	.012	-.290	-1.544	.263	-.073	.034
	hooddiverse	2.111	.453	.873	4.664	.043	.163	4.058

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw

Table 18:

Table

Tables 17 and 18 show the outputs for the college courses data testing the relationship between general feelings of nationalism and English-Only support. As mentioned in the methodology, data was analyzed at the class level using means only. Due to the unusually low number of respondents, or classes, only controls associated with the hypotheses are included in the model to prevent multicollinearity.

Table 17 indicates that the model is statistically significant at .031. There is a significant relationship between the independent and dependent variables and the null hypothesis can be rejected.

Table 18 indicates that two of the four independent variables are statistically significant. The proudness measure (amproud) is significant at .030 with a large coefficient of 1.893. For every unit increase in the proudness measure, there is a 1.893 increase in the English-Only measure (engonlylaw). That is, classes who are more proud to be an American are more likely

to favor English-Only policy. We should be careful to generalize these results given the small sample size. However, it is important to note that a relationship is still there.

The importance of being an American measure (*importanceam*) is also statistically significant at .035 with a large coefficient of 1.053. For every unit increase in the importance measure, there is a 1.053 increase in the English-Only measure. That is, classes who say that being an American is of greater importance to their life are more likely to oppose English-Only policy. This is counterintuitive to the *proudness* variable as well as the findings for the 1994 GSS, 21st Century Americanism and snowball sampling data. It is possible that this variance is due to the question associated with the importance measure being more ambiguous and open to different interpretations.

With the small sample size, one could argue that the identity measure is marginally statistically significant at .117. Table 18 indicates that for every unit increase in the identity measure, the English-Only measure decreases by .431. That is, classes who tend to think of themselves as just an American over a particular ethnic, racial or nationality group are more likely to favor English-Only policy. This finding is consistent with Citrin et al's (1990) finding that a strong national identity is correlated with support for English-Only laws.

Finally, the neighborhood diversity measure (*hooddiverse*) is statistically significant at .043 with a large coefficient of 2.111. For every unit increase in the neighborhood diversity measure, the English-Only measure increases by 2.111. That is, classes who grew up in neighborhoods that were not diverse are more likely to oppose English-Only laws. This is counterintuitive to Bonilla-Silva's (2006) finding that racially progressive people, hypothesized to oppose English-Only laws, are more likely to have grown up in a racially heterogeneous neighborhood. Therefore, Hypothesis 9 is not supported in this model. The relationship between these variables can potentially be explained by the fact that, overall, very few individual respondents reported growing up in diverse neighborhoods. However, as is common on college campuses, there were still high numbers of more progressively oriented respondents that would

most likely hold lower levels of nationalism and oppose English-Only policy. The relationship could also be explained by “Group Threat” theory, which poses that as the size of minority groups increases in neighborhoods, the majority group perceives this as a threat, resulting in more prejudiced attitudes towards these groups (King and Wheelock, 2007; Quillian, 1995).

Ethno-

Cultural

and

Civic

Criteria

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.723	9	.191	12.014	.079 ^b
	Residual	.032	2	.016		
	Total	1.754	11			

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw

b. Predictors: (Constant), hoodddiverse, conservative, usborn_truam, age, chst_truam, education, eng_turam, wht_truam, evangelicalchristian

Table 19.

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	13.208	4.961		2.662	.117	-8.137	34.554
	usborn_truam	1.703	.583	1.772	2.920	.100	-.806	4.213
	wht_truam	-4.134	1.486	-1.299	-2.782	.109	-10.529	2.260
	chst_truam	-.631	.906	-.223	-.697	.558	-4.530	3.268
	eng_turam	.183	.531	.128	.345	.763	-2.102	2.469
	age	-4.395	1.303	-1.219	-3.372	.078	-10.002	1.213
	education	-.269	.315	-.177	-.854	.483	-1.626	1.087
	conservative	.007	.016	.169	.446	.700	-.061	.075
	evangelicalchristian	-.085	.036	-1.284	-2.356	.143	-.241	.070
	hoodddiverse	3.951	1.077	1.635	3.668	.067	-.684	8.586

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw

Tables 19 and 20 show the outputs for the class data testing the relationship between ethno-cultural criteria of national membership and support for English-Only language policy. The civic criteria variables are not included in this model due to issues with multicollinearity. Additionally, the English obligation measure (eng_oblig) and the customs/traditions measure (customs_truam) were removed to due overlap with the other ethno-cultural criteria and to prevent multicollinearity.

Table 19 indicates that the model is marginally statistically significant at .079. Given the small sample size, one could argue this is a relatively strong significance. Therefore, while the null hypothesis cannot explicitly be rejected, there most likely are legitimate relationships present between the independent and dependent variables.

The US born measure (usborn_truam) and the being White measure (wht_truam) are marginally statistically significance at .100 and .109. That is, classes who believe being born in the US is *not* important to being a true American are more likely to oppose English-Only policy. However, classes who believe being White is *not* important to being a true American are more likely to *favor* English-Only policy. This finding contradictory to the previous college course data tables as well as the existing literature (Citrin et al, 1990; Schildkraut, 2003).

Age and the neighborhood diversity measure are also marginally statistically significant at .067 and .078. Consistent with Table 18, Table 20 indicates that classes who grew up in neighborhoods that were not diverse are more likely to oppose English-Only policy. Additionally, Table 20 indicates that as the mean class age increases, favor for English-Only policy increases.⁵

⁵ Because almost all respondents were in the age 18-25 category, this finding is primarily based on a few outliers. Therefore, it is not generalizable, but rather serves mainly as a control in all of the college course models. All of the college course models were run without age and education to see what the effect would be, but it had an insubstantial effect on overall significance levels.

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.752	10	.175	73.227	.091 ^b
	Residual	.002	1	.002		
	Total	1.754	11			

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw

b. Predictors: (Constant), hooddiverse, const_truam, evangelicalchristian, age, vol_truam, econ_truam, education, laws_truam, amval_truam, conservative

Table

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	-.460	.708		-.650	.633	-9.462	8.541
	amval_truam	.798	.213	.363	3.749	.166	-1.906	3.501
	econ_truam	.734	.085	.532	8.599	.074	-.351	1.819
	laws_truam	.346	.067	.407	5.161	.122	-.507	1.200
	const_truam	-.321	.262	-.152	-1.227	.435	-3.645	3.003
	vol_truam	-.798	.152	-.390	-5.246	.120	-2.729	1.134
	age	-.550	.226	-.152	-2.431	.248	-3.423	2.324
	education	.682	.121	.447	5.650	.112	-.852	2.217
	conservative	-.008	.007	-.200	-1.165	.451	-.099	.082
	evangelicalchristian	.013	.007	.198	1.964	.300	-.072	.098
	hooddiverse	-.061	.188	-.025	-.324	.800	-2.448	2.326

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw

Table

Tables 21 and 22 show the outputs for the college course data testing the relationship between civic criteria of national membership and support for English-Only policy. Table 21 indicates that the model is not statistically significant at .091. Again, given the small sample size, this is a relatively strong significance level. However, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

Table 22 shows that none of the independent variables or controls are statistically significant in this model. The variable work ethic variable (econ_truam) is marginally statistically significant at .074. This means that classes who believe pursuing economic success through hard work is *not* important to being a true American are more likely to oppose English-Only language policy. Overall, this model indicates that holding civic criteria of national membership is not significant to English-Only policy support when compared with ethno-cultural criteria. This is consistent with the existing literature (Freundreis and Tatalovich, 1997; Schildkraut, 2003) and supports Hypothesis 2.

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.719	7	.246	27.476	.003 ^b
	Residual	.036	4	.009		
	Total	1.754	11			

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw

b. Predictors: (Constant), hooddiverse, conservative, cb_partners, education, colblind, age, evangelicalchristian

Color-blind Racism Frames

Color-

blind

Racism

Frames

Table 23:

Coefficients ^a							
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	1.066	.491	2.173	.096	-.296	2.428
	colblind	.963	.192	.649	.5012	.429	1.496
	cb_partners	-.847	.189	-.775	.011	-1.373	-.321
	age	.690	.502	.191	1.376	.241	2.083
	education	.701	.194	.460	3.619	.022	1.239
	conservative	-.042	.005	-1.018	-8.021	.001	-.057
	evangelicalchristian	.048	.010	.728	5.041	.007	.075
	hooddiverse	-.893	.355	-.369	-2.514	.066	-1.879

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw

Table 24:

Tables 23 and 24 show the relationship between the general endorsement of color-blind racial ideologies and support for English-Only policies. As with the ethno-cultural and civic datasets, color-blind ideologies were divided up into general endorsement of color-blindness and Bonilla-Silva's four frames due to issues with multicollinearity.

Table 23 shows that the model has a strong statistical significance at .003^b. There is a significant relationship between the independent and dependent variables and the null hypothesis can be rejected.

Table 24 shows that both the general color-blindness measure (colblind) and the color-blind partners measure (cb_partners), are statistically significant at .007 and .011. These coefficients are particularly small, but there is a relationship found in the model. The positive coefficient of the color-blind measure and the negative coefficient of the colorblind partners measure both indicate that those who don't endorse color-blindness are more likely to favor English-Only language. Therefore, this model supports Hypothesis 8.

Education, levels of conservativeness and identifying as an Evangelical Christian are also statistically significant in this model. Specifically, the conservative measure is significant at .001 with a coefficient of -.042. That is, classes with a higher percentage of conservativeness

are more likely to favor English-Only policy. This finding is consistent with the existing literature (Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997) and supports Hypothesis 11.

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.636	8	.204	5.171	.102 ^b
	Residual	.119	3	.040		
	Total	1.754	11			

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw

b. Predictors: (Constant), hooddiverse, conservative, age, affirmact, education, evangelicalchristian, helpblks, coll_affirmact

Table

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	1.679	2.005		.838	.464	-4.700	8.059
	helpblks	-1.172	.837	-.926	-1.400	.256	-3.834	1.491
	affirmact	-1.000	.802	-.662	-1.248	.301	-3.551	1.551
	coll_affirmact	1.254	1.426	.876	.879	.444	-3.284	5.792
	age	.483	1.827	.134	.264	.809	-5.332	6.297
	education	1.176	.455	.771	2.587	.081	-.271	2.623
	conservative	-.006	.020	-.133	-.273	.803	-.070	.059
	evangelicalchristian	-.024	.036	-.365	-.674	.549	-.139	.090
	hooddiverse	-.254	.848	-.105	-.299	.784	-2.953	2.446

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw

Table 26:

Of the models testing Bonilla-Silva's (2011) four frames of color-blind racism, the abstract liberalism model was closest to statistical significance at .102, as shown in Table 25. Therefore, none of the tables for the other color-blind models are reported in this section, as

they were not marginally close to statistical significance. Instead, they can be found in Appendix 2.

Additionally, none of the independent or demographic variables in Table 25 or the other models are statistically significant. This is surprising, given the strong relationship between the general endorsement of color-blindness and support for English-Only policy shown in Table 24.

Conclusions

Principal Findings

In this study, four diverse samples were subjected to analysis across time and space, and several noteworthy similarities emerged from the results. Overall, the three main hypotheses regarding general levels of nationalism, criteria of national membership and color-blind racial ideologies (H_1 , H_2 , H_3 and H_6) are found to be supported throughout the datasets. However, which models and which specific variables are significant varies across the models.

The majority of the models indicate that support for English-Only policy is related to increased pride in the nation. The online survey data was the only model that did not show a significant relationship between pride in the nation and support for English-Only policy. Nevertheless, general support for Hypothesis 1 can still be reported from the models. This finding is consistent with the results from existing literature. Specifically, it builds off of Citrin et al's (1990) finding that positive attachment to symbols of Americanism is correlated with increased support for English-Only policies.

The results for the criteria of national membership models were less clear. When based solely on the nationally representative dataset, there is an obvious relationship between the endorsement of ethno-cultural criteria of national membership even when controlling for civic criteria. In the online data model, while none of the independent variables are statistically significant, the ethno-cultural criteria are closer to significance than the civic criteria. Finally, in the college course data, the ethno-cultural criteria were actually less significant overall

compared to the civic criteria, but the coefficients for the ethno-cultural criteria were much larger. In sum, even though the models don't align perfectly, the overarching trends in the smaller datasets indicate that ethno-cultural criteria does have some impact on support for English-Only policies. The strong statistical significance in the nationally representative dataset provides assurance that the relationship predicted is in fact there. This finding is also supported by the existing literature that tests the relationship between these two concepts (Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997; Garcia and Bass, 2007; Schildkraut, 2003). As mentioned above, the small sample sizes and non-representative demographics most likely the cause of variance between the outputs.

Surprisingly, speaking English as an ethno-cultural criteria was only found to be statistically significant in the nationally representative model. One would expect that, even given the small sample sizes, the connection between this measure and support for English-Only policies would be very strong in the original data models. However, when comparing across the datasets, being born in the US was the only ethnocultural variable found to be statistically significant in all three models. This suggests that, as Frendreis and Tatalovich (1997) found, there is an important relationship between hostility towards foreign groups and support for English-Only policy. This is also supported by the 21st Century Americanism model testing color-blind ideologies, where both independent variables measuring discriminatory attitudes towards immigrants were found to be statistically significant.

Furthermore, the results indicate that color-blind ideologies do have an impact on support for English-Only policy, but which frames are significant and at what level varies across the datasets. As Bonilla-Silva (2011) indicates in his study, the four frameworks are complex, overlapping and don't always function in absolutes. Therefore, it is not very surprising to see that there is no clear cut relationship in the models as well. However, abstract liberalism was found to be statistically significant in both of the nationally representative datasets, and was the closest to statistical significance among the class level datasets. Additionally, cultural racism

was also found to be of importance in more than one model, the 1994 GSS Dataset and the online data model.

Compared to the other two frames tested in every dataset, cultural racism and minimization of racism, it is not surprising that abstract liberalism is the frame that shows up the most. While color-blind ideologies are a covert form of racism, some of the frames are arguably more inflammatory than others. Specifically, cultural racism is the one frame that addresses the qualities of people of color themselves rather than systematic discrimination or institutional obligations. Particularly in the college course model, where there is a disproportionate number of millennials (found by Bonilla-Silva (2006) to be more racially progressive than older generations), it is predictable that this type of racism would be especially frowned upon relative to the more representative 1994 GSS and online survey samples.

Comparatively, abstract liberalism is arguably the most covert of the four frames, as it masks racial hostility behind admired values such as equality and meritocracy. Because abstract liberalism emphasizes an equal playing field among all citizens, it is possible that some people could interpret an official language as a step towards that equal playing field among all citizens. Or rather, they may feel strongly that it should be the obligation of foreigners to learn English if they want to have the same privileges that fluent English speakers enjoy, stressing the importance of meritocracy. If foreigners want the same benefits and opportunities for success as native-English speakers, they shouldn't be given any special accommodations, including linguistic ones, and should instead work their way up.

Among the demographic control variables, there was also variation across the datasets. Political ideology was the control variable that was statistically significant in the most models. However, ideology was not found to be significant in most of the class datasets. This is possibly due the small sample size, or could be the result of an overall lower percentage of non-liberal respondents within the class data.

Identifying as an Evangelical Christian was only found to be statistically significant in the 1994 GSS data, and therefore Hypothesis 4 cannot be supported. Surprisingly, identifying as an Evangelical Christian was not found to be significant in 21st Century Americanism, the other nationally representative dataset. This is most likely due to the fact that who was considered an Evangelical Christian was much narrower within the 21st Century model. Only Baptists/Southern Baptists were measured as Evangelical Christians, as they were the only response category that can overwhelmingly be identified as such.

Finally, neither education or neighborhood diversity were found to be statistically significant across the models, disproving Hypotheses 5, 8 and 9. Of the neighborhood diversity measures in the 21st Century Americanism model, living in a predominantly White neighborhood was the closest to statistical significance compared to the other racial groups. This suggests that those who live in White neighborhoods are more likely to support English-Only policy, but the model lacks the significance needed to support this statistically.

Political Implications

The desire to make English the official language of the United States dates back to the founding of the country. Yet throughout all of these years, English has yet to become the official language on a national level (Citrin et al, 1990). However, some argue that we are currently at an unparalleled moment in our history, both politically and socially, as a newfound rise of nativist and nationalist sentiment is sweeping through the country. Results from this study show preliminary evidence that, even when controlling for political ideology and civic attitudes, support for English-Only policy is driven in part by ethno-cultural and racial attitudes. This relationship is troubling for the state of our democracy. As the nation continues to grow more diverse, it is critical that new policies are not based on ethno-cultural or racial hostility, and that we implement policies that don't just benefit the majority. However, with a new presidential administration that continuously advocates for American-centered policies and practices, it is very possible that a national law favoring the English-speaking majority could be put on the

table throughout the next four years. Within just the past several months, the Trump Administration has continuously made attempts to isolate various ethnic and cultural minorities, particularly Mexican immigrants and Middle-Eastern refugees. If this dangerous “us versus them” mentality continues to spread through the nation, it is possible that endorsement of ethno-cultural criteria of national membership will increase, leading to more pressure from the public make English the official language by law. Previous studies have indicated that holding ethno-cultural criteria of national membership is correlated with hostility towards immigrants and other cultural minorities (Bonikowski and DiMaggio, 2016; Citrin, Reingold and Green, 1990). An English-Only law could be just one further way to ostracize and oppress an already marginalized group in society.

However, even though the Trump Administration may have made it increasingly acceptable to express openly hostile attitudes towards cultural minority groups (Schaffner et al), 2017, the majority of the population is still in opposition to most explicit forms of discrimination. Language discrimination has been considered by scholars to be the replacement for past discriminatory policies that were more clearly based on race and ethnicity (Lippi-Green, 1997 as cited by Pac, 2012). This study fills a crucial gap in the existing literature by examining how the covert forms of racial discrimination present in society today are connected to English-Only policy, thereby providing a better understanding of the rationalization behind monolingual support.

Based on the results of this study, it is clear that there is a connection between abstract liberalism and support for English-Only policy. Therefore, it is possible that a future English-Only proposal would incite the seemingly virtuous values of equality and meritocracy in justifying its implementation. This would make attempts to oppose the law more difficult than if more explicit forms of prejudice were the basis of its implementation. However, even if abstract liberalist values such as equality and meritocracy are what an English-Only proposal is founded on, once it is actually put into place, it is likely that such a policy would be used to justify other, more

explicit forms of discrimination. It will be critical for citizens and politicians alike to read between the lines and uncover the covert racial and ethnic biases that are often embedded in English-Only policies.

Limitations and Future Directions

While this study enhances the existing literature in several important ways, there are also limitations that need to be addressed. The main limitations are revolve around the restrictions that come with using non-representative datasets. Findings from the online data and class data can't be generalized to the nation at large. Furthermore, the sample sizes of the originally collected data make interpretation of the results challenging, as statistical significance is likely impacted by the small size.

Additionally, the limited availability of variables within the secondary data sets meant that some concepts couldn't be categorized completely in all of the models. First, the 1994 GSS data couldn't be used to test criteria of national membership. Next, 21st Century could only measure two of the frameworks of color-blind racism: abstract liberalism and minimization of racism. Finally, neither secondary dataset had a variable that could be used to measure naturalization of racism. Therefore, future studies would benefit from a nationally representative dataset that is able to fully capture all of these concepts.

A additional direction for future studies would be to further examine people of color who endorse color-blind racial ideologies, and how this impacts their support or opposition towards English-Only policies. According to Manning et al (2015), Blacks and Hispanics are increasingly more likely to endorse color-blind racial ideologies. However, studies have also found that Blacks and Hispanics are generally less likely to endorse English-Only policy (Citrin et al, 1990; Frensdreis and Tatalovich, 1997). The results of this study indicate that endorsement of color-blind racial ideologies, specifically abstract liberalism and cultural racism, is correlated with increased support for English-Only policies even when controlling for Whiteness and Hispanicity. However, the significance of race and Hispanicity varies across the models, and

Hispanicity was not tested in either nationally representative dataset. This begs the question, is ethnic identification more important than color-blind ideologies in influencing support for English-Only policy? Future studies might focus on analyzing how color-blind racial ideologies impact minority groups' support for English-Only policy.

References

- Aleinikoff, T. A. 1991. "A Case for Race-Consciousness." *Columbia Law Review* 91(5):1060-1125 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1122845>). doi: 10.2307/1122845.
- "Americans Overwhelmingly Put English First." 2014. Rasmussen Reports, 2017. (http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/lifestyle/general_lifestyle/august_2014/americans_overwhelmingly_put_english_first).
- Bonikowski, Bart. 2008. "Research on American Nationalism: Review of the Literature, Annotated Bibliography, and Directory of Publicly Available Data Sets.", Princeton University.
- Bonikowski, Bart and Paul DiMaggio. 2016. "Varieties of American Popular Nationalism." *American Sociological Review* 81(5):949-980. doi: 10.1177/0003122416663683.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo and David Dietrich. 2011. "The Sweet Enchantment of Color-Blind Racism in Obamerica." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 634:190-206 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/29779402>).
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2006. "Racism without Racists : Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States." Lanham: The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
- Borden, Rebecca S. 2014. "The English Only Movement: Revisiting Cultural Hegemony." *Multicultural Perspectives* 16(4):229-233 (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15210960.2014.956607>). doi: 10.1080/15210960.2014.956607.
- Citrin, Jack, Beth Reingold and Donald P. Green. 1990. "American Identity and the Politics of Ethnic Change." *Jpolitics the Journal of Politics* 52(4):1124-1154.
- Citrin, Jack, Beth Reingold, Evelyn Walters and Donald P. Green. 1990. "The "Official English" Movement and the Symbolic Politics of Language in the United States." *The Western Political Quarterly* 43(3):535-559 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/448703>). doi: 10.2307/448703.
- Collins, Randall. 2012. "Time-Bubbles of Nationalism: Dynamics of Solidarity Ritual in Lived Time." *NANA Nations and Nationalism* 18(3):383-397.
- Denison, Benjamin. 2016. "The Appeal of Ethnic Resentment." Washington Post. *The Monkey Cage* Blogs.
- Dovidio JF, SL Gaertner and T Saguy. 2009. "Commonality and the Complexity of "we": Social Attitudes and Social Change." *Personality and Social Psychology Review : An Official Journal of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc* 13(1):3-20.

- Edelstein, Alex S. 1962. "Since Bennington: Evidence of Change in Student Political Behavior." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 26(4):564.
- Flagg, Barbara J. 1993. "'Was Blind, but Now I See': White Race Consciousness and the Requirement of Discriminatory Intent." *Michigan Law Review* 91(5):953-1017 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1289678>). doi: 10.2307/1289678.
- Freundreis, John and Raymond Tatalovich. 1997. "Who Supports English-Only Language Laws? Evidence from the 1992 National Election Study." *Social Science Quarterly* 78(2):354-368 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/42864342>).
- Garcia, Carlos and Loretta E. Bass. 2007. "American Identity and Attitudes Toward English Language Policy Initiatives." *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare* 34(1).
- Goldmacher, Shane. 2016. "Trump's English-Only Campaign." POLITICO, 2017. (<http://www.politico.com/story/2016/09/donald-trumps-english-only-campaign-228559>).
- Helman, E, SL Gaertner, JF Dovidio, EW Mania, R Guerra, DC Wilson and BM Friel. 2012. "Group Status Drives Majority and Minority Integration Preferences." *Psychological Science* 23(1):46-52.
- Holtzman, Wayne H. 1956. "Attitudes of College Men Toward Non-Segregation in Texas Schools." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 20(3):559.
- King, Ryan D. and Darren Wheelock. 2007. "Group Threat and Social Control: Race, Perceptions of Minorities and the Desire to Punish." *Social Forces* 85(3):1255-1280.
- Kloss, Hein. 1971. "Language Rights of Immigrant Groups." *Intemigrrevi International Migration Review* 5(2):250-268.
- Lewis, Amanda E. 2001. "There is no 'Race' in the Schoolyard: Color-Blind Ideology in an (almost) all-White School." *American Educational Research Journal* 38(4):781-811 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3202503>).
- Lippi-Green, R. 1999. "English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States Terry A. Osborn." *Language Problems and Language Planning* 23:209-210.
- Manning, Alex, Douglas Hartmann and Joseph Gerteis. 2015. "Colorblindness in Black and White." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 1(4):532-546 (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2332649215584828>). doi: 10.1177/2332649215584828.
- Meitinger, Katharina. 2015. "Can we Measure Nationalism Or Patriotism by Asking about Pride in a Cross-National Context?" *European Survey Research Association*.
- Murphy, Laura W, Deborah J Vagins, Joanne Lin, Gabriel Rottman, Christopher Rickerd. 2012. "Written Statement of the American Civil Liberties Union for a Hearing on 'H.R. 997, the English Language Unity Act of 2011.'".
- Neville, Helen A, Lilly L Roderick, Georgia Duran, Richard M Lee and LaVonne Browne. 2000. "Construction and Initial Validation of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS)." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 47(1):59-70.
- Nieto, David G. 2015. "The Politics of Official English: Exploring the Intentions and the Outcomes Behind English-Only Policies in the United States.", University of Massachusetts Boston.

- Nogee, Philip and Murray B. Levin. 1958. "Some Determinants of Political Attitudes among College Voters." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 22(4):449.
- Nteta, Tatishe and Brian Schaffner. 206. "Pining for a Whiter America." The Washington Post. *The Monkey Cage Blogs*.
- Pac, Teresa. 2012. "The English-Only Movement in the US and the World in the Twenty-First Century." *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology* 11(1):192-210.
- Quillian, Lincoln,. 1995. "Prejudice as a Response to Perceived Group Threat: Population Composition and Anti-Immigrant and Racial Prejudice in Europe." *American Sociological Review*. 60(4):586.
- Rahn, Wendy. 2004. "Feeling, Thinking, Being, Doing: Public Mood, American National Identity and Civic Participation." Paper presented at Midwest Political Science Association annual meeting, Chicago, April 17.
- Rep. King, Steve. *H.R. 997-English Unity Act of 2017*, 2017 (<https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/997>).
- Schaffner, Brian, Matthew MacWilliams and Tatishe Nteta. 2017. "Explaining White Polarization in the 2016 Vote for President: The Sobering Role of Racism and Sexism " Conference on The U.S. Elections of 2016: Domestic and International Aspects.
- Schildkraut, Deborah J. 2003. "American Identity and Attitudes Toward Official-English Policies." *Political Psychology* 24(3):469-499 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3792322>).
- Schofield, J. W. 1986. "Causes and consequences of the colorblind perspective."in *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives*. "Causes and consequences of the colorblind perspective." Hoboken, N.J: Wiley.
- Stilz, Anna. 2009. "Civic Nationalism and Language Policy." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 37(3):257-292 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/40468467>).
- Tarca, Katherine. 2005. "Colorblind in Control: The Risks of Resisting Difference Amid Demographic Change." *Educational Studies* 38(2):99-120.
- Tatum, Beverly D. 2003. *"Why are all the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?" : And Other Conversations about Race*. New York: Basic Books.
- Tesler, Michael. 2015. "Riding the Anti-Immigrant Wave." *Washington Post*, .
- Wiley, Terrence G. and Marguerite Lukes. 1996. "English-Only and Standard English Ideologies in the U.S." *TESOL Quarterly* 30(3):511-535 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3587696>). doi: 10.2307/3587696.
- Zamudio, Margaret M. and Francisco Rios. 2006. "From Traditional to Liberal Racism: Living Racism in the Everyday." *Sociological Perspectives* 49(4):483-501 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sop.2006.49.4.483>). doi: 10.1525/sop.2006.49.4.483.

Appendix 1

1994 GSS Variable Questions

engoffcl: Do you favor a law making English the official language of the United States, meaning government business would be conducted in English only, or do you oppose such a law?

Favor

Neither favor nor oppose

Oppose

Don't Know

Not Applicable

age: Respondent's Self-Reported Age

polviews: We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. I'm going to show you a seven-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal--point 1--to extremely conservative--point 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale?

Extremely Liberal

Liberal

Slightly Liberal

Moderate

Slightly Conservative

Conservative

Extremely Conservative

Don't Know

No Answer

Not Applicable

educ: A. What is the highest grade in elementary school or high school that you finished and got credit for? CODE EXACT GRADE.

B. IF FINISHED 9th-12th GRADE OR DK*: Did you ever get a high school diploma or a GED certificate? [SEE D BELOW.] [See REMARKS]

C. Did you complete one or more years of college for credit--not including schooling such as business college, technical or vocational school? IF YES: How many years did you complete? Do you have any college degrees? (IF YES: What degree or degrees?) CODE HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED.

race: What race do you consider yourself?

Black

White

Other

class: If you were asked to use one of four names for your social class, which would you say you belong in: the lower class, the working class, the middle class, or the upper class?

Lower Class

Working Class

Middle Class

Upper Class

Don't Know

No answer

Not applicable

raclive: Are there any (“whites” for black respondents, “blacks” for non-black respondents) living in this neighborhood now?

Yes

No

Don't Know

No answer

Not applicable

sex: Respondent's self-reported sex

Male

Female

denom: What is your religious preference? Is it Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, some other religion, or no religion?

A. What specific denomination is that, if any? (PROBE FOR EXACT DENOMINATION)

Am baptist asso

Am bapt ch in usa

Nat bapt conv of am

Nat bapt conv usa

Southern baptist

Other baptists

Baptist-dk which

Afr meth episcopal

Afr meth ep zion

United methodist

Other methodist

Methodist-kd which

AM lutheran

Luth ch in america

Lutheran-mo synod

Wi evan luth synod

Other lutheran

Evangelical luth

Lutheran-dk which

Presbyterian c in us

United pres ch in us

Other presbyterian

Presbyterian, merged

Presbyterian-dk wh

Episcopal

Other

No denomination

Don't Know

No Answer

Not applicable

fund: Fundamentalism/Liberalism of Respondent's Religion

Fundamentalist

Moderate

Liberal

Na-excluded

amproud: How proud are you to be an American . . . extremely proud, very proud, somewhat proud, or not very proud?

Extremely proud
 Very proud
 Somewhat proud
 Not very proud
 Don't know
 No answer
 Not applicable

affrmact: Some people say that because of past discrimination, blacks should be given preference in hiring and promotion. Others say that such preference in hiring and promotion of blacks is wrong because it discriminates against whites. What about your opinion -- are you for or against preferential hiring and promotion of blacks?

IF FAVORS: A. Do you favor preference in hiring and promotion strongly or not strongly? IF

OPPOSES: B. Do you oppose preference in hiring and promotion strongly or not strongly?

Strongly support
 Support
 Oppose
 Strongly Oppose
 Don't know
 No answer
 Not applicable

racdif1: On the average (Negroes/Blacks/African-Americans) have worse jobs, income, and housing than white people. Do you think these differences are . . . A. Mainly due to discrimination?

Yes
 Not
 Don't know
 No answer
 Not applicable

racdif3: On the average (Negroes/Blacks/African-Americans) have worse jobs, income, and housing than white people. Do you think these differences are . . . C. Because most (Negroes/Blacks/African-Americans) don't have the chance for education that it takes to rise out of poverty?

Yes
 No
 Don't Know
 No answer
 Not applicable

racdif4: On the average (Negroes/Blacks/African-Americans) have worse jobs, income, and housing than white people. Do you think these differences are . . . D. Because most (Negroes/Blacks/African-Americans) just don't have the motivation or will power to pull themselves up out of poverty?

Yes

No
 Don't Know
 No answer
 Not applicable

21st Century Americanism Variable Questions

engoff: Now I have some questions about language policy in the United States. Do you favor or oppose a law making English the official language of the United States, meaning most government business would be conducted in English only?

Favor
 Oppose
 Neither favor nor oppose
 Don't know
 No answer

ideology: Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as conservative, moderate, or liberal?

Conservative
 Moderate
 Liberal
 Other (Please specify) [open responses]
 Don't know
 No Answer

education: What is the highest grade of school or year of college you have completed?

Less than high school diploma
 High school grad
 Trade/Vocational school
 Some college (No degree or associate's degree)
 Bachelor's Degree (BA or BS)
 Some graduate school (No degree)
 Graduate level degree
 Don't Know
 No answer

income: Please tell me if the total amount of income, before taxes received, by all of the members in your household during 2003 was above or below \$45,000.

Above or equal to \$45,000
 Below \$45,000
 Don't Know
 No Answer

race: What race do you consider yourself to be... (white, black, asian, native american, or some other race)?

White/Caucasian
 Black/African American
 Asian
 Native American
 Some other race (Please specify single race)
 Hispanic/Latino

Mixed (Please specify multi race)
 Don't know
 No answer

religion: What, if any, is your religious preference? (IWR: If a respondent offers the term Protestant or Christian and then names a specific branch of that religion then code the specific branch that is given. For example: "Protestant" and "Baptist" are given you would code that answer as "Baptist")

Agnostic
 Atheist
 Baptist/Southern Baptist
 Buddhist
 Catholic
 Christian
 Episcopalian
 Jehovah's Witness
 Jewish
 Lutheran
 Methodist/United Methodist
 Mormon/Church of Latter Day Saints
 Muslim
 Presbyterian
 Protestant
 Quaker
 Seventh Day Adventist
 Other (Please specify)
 Don't Know
 No answer

sex: ASK IF NECESSARY " For survey purposes, I need to ask are you male or female?"

Male
 Female
 No Answer

racliv: In general, would you say that your neighborhood is

Mostly White
 Mostly Black
 Mostly Latino
 Mostly Asian
 Or Multi-Ethnic
 No Answer

proud: I am proud to be an American. (Do you)

Strongly Agree
 Somewhat Agree
 Somewhat Disagree
 Strongly Disagree
 Don't know
 No Answer

amworkall: Pursuing economic success through hard work. (Would you say that it should be very important, somewhat important, somewhat unimportant, or very unimportant in making someone a true American)

Very important

Somewhat Important

Somewhat Unimportant

Very Unimportant

Don't know

No Answer

amlawsall: Respecting America's political institutions and laws. (Would you say that it should be very important, somewhat important, somewhat unimportant, or very unimportant in making someone a true American)

Very important

Somewhat Important

Somewhat Unimportant

Very Unimportant

Don't know

No Answer

aminfoall: Being informed about local and national politics. (Would you say that it should be very important, somewhat important, somewhat unimportant, or very unimportant in making someone a true American)

Very important

Somewhat Important

Somewhat Unimportant

Very Unimportant

Don't know

No Answer

amwhiteall: Being white. (Would you say that it should be very important, somewhat important, somewhat unimportant, or very unimportant in making someone a true American)

Very important

Somewhat Important

Somewhat Unimportant

Very Unimportant

Don't know

No Answer

amengall: Being able to speak English. (Would you say that it should be very important, somewhat important, somewhat unimportant, or very unimportant in making someone a true American)

Very important

Somewhat Important

Somewhat Unimportant

Very Unimportant

Don't know

No Answer

ambornall: Being born in America. (Would you say that it should be very important, somewhat important, somewhat unimportant, or very unimportant in making someone a true American)

Very important
 Somewhat Important
 Somewhat Unimportant
 Very Unimportant
 Don't know
 No Answer

prej.immigrants: Irish, Italians, and Jews overcame prejudice and worked their way up.
 Today's immigrants should do the same. (Do you)

Strongly agree
 Somewhat agree
 Somewhat disagree
 Strongly disagree
 Don't know
 No Answer

dis.immigrants: Years of discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for
 immigrants to work their way out of the lower class. (Do you)

Strongly agree
 Somewhat agree
 Somewhat disagree
 Strongly disagree
 Don't know
 No Answer

Online and Class Data Variable Questions

age: What is your age?

18-25
 26-30
 31-35
 36-40
 41-45
 46-50
 51-55
 56 or above

gender: What gender do you identify as?

Female
 Male
 Other (please specify)

race: What race do you consider yourself to be?

White
 Black/African American
 Asian
 Native American
 Mixed Race
 Other (please specify)

hispanicity: Do you consider yourself Hispanic or Latino (of any race)?

Yes

No

class: If you were asked to use one of four names for your social class, which would you say you belong in: the lower class, the working class, the middle class or the upper class?

Lower class

Working Class

Middle Class

Upper Class

Don't Know

income: Based on your best estimate, what was the approximate annual household income of the home you grew up in?

Less than \$11,000

\$11,001-30,000

\$30,001-50,000

\$50,001-70,000

\$70,001-90,000

\$90,001-110,000

\$110,001-150,000

\$150,001-200,000

\$200,001-\$250,000

\$250,001 or more

education: What is the highest grade of school or year of college you have completed?

Less than high school diploma

High school grad

Trade/Vocational school

Some college (no degree or associate's degree)

Bachelor's degree (BA or BS)

Some graduate school (no degree)

Graduate level degree

Doctoral level degree

Don't know

ideology: When it comes to politics, would you describe yourself as conservative, moderate or liberal?

Conservative

Moderate

Liberal

Other

Don't Know

evangelicalchristian: Do you identify as an Evangelical Christian?

Yes

No

Don't Know

justworld: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Our society is generally a just place where everyone gets what they deserve.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Neither Agree or Disagree
 Disagree
 Strongly Disagree
 Don't Know

racerelete: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: I have had meaningful relationships (platonic or romantic) with people of other races.

Strongly Agree
 Agree
 Neither Agree or Disagree
 Disagree
 Strongly Disagree
 Don't Know

hooddiverse: How would you describe the diversity (based on racial makeup) of the neighborhood you grew up in?

Very Diverse
 Somewhat Diverse
 Not Diverse
 Don't Know

engonlylaw: Do you favor a law making English the official language of the United States, meaning that all government business would be conducted in English only, or do you oppose such a law?

Strongly Favor
 Favor
 Neither Favor or Oppose
 Oppose
 Strongly Oppose
 Don't Know

proud: How proud are you to be an American?

Extremely proud
 Very proud
 Somewhat proud
 Not very proud
 Don't Know

importanceam: How important is being an American to you where 0 is not at all important and 5 is the most important thing in your life.

0
 1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 Don't Know

usashamed: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: There are some things about the United States that make me feel ashamed.

Strongly Agree

Agree
 Neither Agree or Disagree
 Disagree
 Strongly Disagree
 Don't Know

identity: If you had to choose, which would you think of yourself most of the time-- mainly as a member of a particular ethnic, racial or nationality group, or mainly as just an American?

A particular ethnic, racial or nationality group
 Just an American
 It depends
 Don't Know

engoblig: Some people feel that there are certain obligations that American citizens owe their country. Do you feel that being able to speak and understand English is a very important obligation, a somewhat important obligation, or not an obligation that citizens owe to the country.

Very Important
 Somewhat Important
 Not an Obligation
 Don't Know

usborn_truam: How important is being born in the United States to being a true American?

Very important
 Fairly important
 Not very important
 Not important at all
 Don't Know

wht_truam: How important is being White to being a true American?

Very important
 Fairly important
 Not very important
 Not important at all
 Don't Know

chst_truam: How important is being a Christian to being a true American?

Very important
 Fairly important
 Not very important
 Not important at all
 Don't Know

amval_truam: How important is sharing American values to being a true American?

Very important
 Fairly important
 Not very important
 Not important at all
 Don't Know

eng_truam: How important is speaking English to being a true American?

Very important
 Fairly important
 Not very important

Not important at all
Don't Know

econ_truam: How important is pursuing economic success through hard work to being a true American?

Very important
Fairly important
Not very important
Not important at all
Don't Know

laws_truam: How important is respecting the United State's political institutions and laws to being a true American?

Very important
Fairly important
Not very important
Not important at all
Don't Know

const_truam: How important is respecting the Constitution to being a true American?

Very important
Fairly important
Not very important
Not important at all
Don't Know

vol_truam: How important is doing volunteer work in one's community to being a true American?

Very important
Fairly important
Not very important
Not important at all
Don't Know

sharecustoms: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: It is impossible for people who do not share American customs and traditions to become fully American.

Very important
Fairly important
Not very important
Not important at all
Don't Know

colblind: Some people say that they are color-blind when it comes to other races. That is, they don't see race. Do you consider yourself to be color-blind?

Yes
No
It depends

cb_partners: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Race is not something that I think about when considering friends or romantic partners.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree/Disagree
Disagree

Strongly Disagree

helpblks: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Blacks have been discriminated against for so long that the government has an obligation to improve their living standards.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Neither Agree/Disagree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

affrmact: Some people say that because of past discrimination, Blacks should be given preference in hiring and promotion. Others say that such preference in the hiring and promotion of Blacks is wrong because it discriminates against others. What about your opinion--are you for or against preferential hiring and promotion of Blacks?

Strongly support

Support

Neither support/oppose

Oppose

Strongly oppose

coll_affrmact: Some people say that because of past discrimination, Blacks should be given preference in college admission. Others say that such preference in the hiring and promotion of Blacks is wrong because it discriminates against others. What about your opinion--are you for or against preferential admission of Blacks?

Strongly support

Support

Neither support/oppose

Oppose

Strongly oppose

naturalhood: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Neighborhoods are often segregated because members of different races naturally gravitate towards people like themselves.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Neither Agree/Disagree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

naturalfrnds: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Lack of diversity within friend groups is usually not due to racism but because people naturally gravitate towards those most like themselves.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Neither Agree/Disagree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

naturalpref: Do you think, generally speaking, all racial groups prefer to be surrounded by people most like themselves?

Yes
No

culturacism1: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: The culture that Blacks and Hispanics grew up in is what makes it difficult for them to succeed.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Neither Agree/Disagree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

culturacism2: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: It's really just a matter of some people not trying hard enough. If Blacks and Hispanics would only try harder, they could be just as well off as other people in the United States.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Neither Agree/Disagree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

discrimdif: Blacks have worse jobs, income and housing than White people. Do you think these differences are mainly due to differences in upbringing?

Yes

No

discrimdif2: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Years of discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for Blacks to work their way out of the lower class.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Neither Agree/Disagree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

discrimdif3: In general, do you think present discrimination is preventing Blacks from succeeding in America?

Yes

No

Appendix 2

Class Data Naturalization Model

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.546	7	.221	4.235	.091 ^b
	Residual	.209	4	.052		
	Total	1.754	11			

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw

b. Predictors: (Constant), evangelicalchristian, naturalfrnds, age, ideology, naturalpref.yes, education, naturalhood

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	-.942	2.070		-.455	.673	-6.688	4.805
	naturalhood	.809	.973	.604	.831	.453	-1.894	3.512
	naturalfrnds	.045	.857	.026	.052	.961	-2.335	2.425
	naturalpref.yes	-.003	.009	-.089	-.372	.729	-.028	.021
	age	-1.573	1.086	-.436	-1.448	.221	-4.588	1.443
	education	.400	.525	.262	.762	.488	-1.057	1.857
	ideology	.864	.556	.528	1.554	.195	-.680	2.408
	evangelicalchristian	.023	.019	.345	1.222	.289	-.029	.075

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw

Class Data Cultural Racism Model

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.558	7	.223	4.532	.081 ^b
	Residual	.196	4	.049		
	Total	1.754	11			

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw

b. Predictors: (Constant), evangelicalchristian, discrimdif.yes, age, ideology, cultracism1, education, cultracism2

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.252	3.677		.613	.573	-7.956	12.461
	cultracism1	-.752	.660	-.563	-1.139	.318	-2.586	1.081
	cultracism2	-.709	.801	-.649	-.885	.426	-2.934	1.516
	discrimdif.yes	-.021	.012	-.753	-1.712	.162	-.056	.013
	age	-.920	.756	-.255	-1.216	.291	-3.020	1.180
	education	1.000	.432	.655	2.312	.082	-.201	2.200
	ideology	1.903	.870	1.162	2.187	.094	-.513	4.320
	evangelicalchristian	-.013	.022	-.200	-.601	.580	-.075	.048

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw

Class Data Minimization of Racism Model**ANOVA^a**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.559	6	.260	6.662	.028 ^b
	Residual	.195	5	.039		
	Total	1.754	11			

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw

b. Predictors: (Constant), evangelicalchristian, discrimdif3.yes, age, education, discrimdif2, ideology

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	.889	2.076		.428	.686	-4.447	6.225
	discrimdif2	-.807	.446	-.570	-1.812	.130	-1.953	.338
	discrimdif3.yes	.007	.009	.305	.785	.468	-.016	.031
	age	-.293	.705	-.081	-.416	.695	-2.105	1.518
	education	.969	.287	.636	3.383	.020	.233	1.706
	ideology	.095	.736	.058	.129	.902	-1.796	1.987
	evangelicalchristian	-.002	.015	-.030	-.129	.902	-.042	.038

a. Dependent Variable: engonlylaw

